DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 236 278	UD 023 156
TITLE	Report to the United States District Court, District of Massachusetts, on Boston School Desegregation. Volume II.
INSTITUTION	Massachusetts State Board of Education, Boston.
PUB DATE	15 Jul 83
NOTE	612p.; For a related document, see UD 023 155. Document may not reproduce well.
PUB TYPE	Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - General (140)
EDRS PRICE	MF03/PC25 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Bilingual Education; College School Cooperation; Compliance (Legal); Conflict Resolution; Desegregation Effects; Discipline; Elementary Secondary Education; Magnet Schools; Parent Associations; Personnel Integration; *Racial Composition; School Business Relationship; *School Desegregation; School Security; Special Education; Student Organizations; Student Placement; Student Transportation; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Boston Public Schools MA

ABSTRACT

This is the first of a series of planned studies undertaken (by court order) by the Massachusetts State Board of Education in order to monitor the progress toward desegregation in the Boston Public Schools. This volume includes the reports produced by department staff in areas monitored, together with selected statistical and other information provided to the department by the public school system. The 12 areas for which extensive reports are provided include: (1) student assignments (with statistical breakdowns by grade level, type of class, and type of school); (2) staff and teacher desegregation; (3) special desegregation efforts in particular schools; (4) special education; (5) bilingual education; (6) occupational education; (7) student transportation; (8) school facilities; (9) school safety and security; (10) student discipline; (11) institutional pairings (with colleges/universities and businesses); and (12) parent and student organizations. Attached is a "report and recommendation of resolution" regarding the desegregation dispute raised by the Boston Teachers Union. (GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED236278

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
BOARD OF EDUCATION

REPORT TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

ON

BOSTON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

VOLUME II

JULY 15, 1983

UD 023 156

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
P. J. Meleen
Mass. Dept. of Ed.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

INTRODUCTION

> "The State Board shall submit a written report to the court, parties, and the CPC by January 15 and July 15 of each year this order remains in effect, summarizing its activities pursuant to S. IV A during the previous six months. The first such report shall be filed by July 15, 1983" (Memorandum and Orders of Disengagement, December 23, 1982).

Volume 1, the much smaller companion to the present document, is a statement of the findings of the Board's "monitoring the school defendants' efforts and activities toward fulfilling their affirmative duty to remedy all vestiges of their violation of the educational rignts under the Fourteenth Amendment of minority students in the Boston public schools." Volume 1 summarizes these findings in each of twelve areas, along with the resolution of disputes arising from the implementation of outstanding orders of the Court.

The present Volume 2 includes the reports produced by staff of the Department in the various areas monitored, together with selections from the information provided to the Department by the Boston Public Schools. The purpose of Volume 2 is to serve as documentary support for the findings which appear in Volume 1, and thus to permit the Court, the parties, the Citywide Parent Council, and the public to understand on what basis the findings were made.

This July 1983 Report is the first prepared under the Memorandum and Orders of Disengagement. Subsequent reports will undoubtedly exhibit more consistency of style and approach; Volume 2 is the product of many hands.

Commissioner John H. Lawson has taken personal responsibility for monitoring and other aspects of the Board's responsibilities toward the Court, and he has designated senior managers to oversee the reports in their program areas. The reports appearing in this volume are as provided and approved by the following individuals:

Staff, Bilingual Education, Student Discipline, Institutional Pairings, Parent and Student Organizations	James Case
Special Education	Roger Brown
Vocational/Occupational Education	David Cronin
Facilities	John Raftery
Safety and Security	Franklin Banks
Assignments, Special Desegregation, and Transportation	Charles Glenn

It remains only to thank Dr. Judith Taylor and Ellen Kanakis for extensive assistance in collecting, editing, and preparing this volume.

Charles Glenn, Report Coordinator

CONTENTS OF VOLUME 2

Page (at bottom)

Introduction 1

Assignments

- Overview 5
- Space Matrix 13
- Examination Schools 17
- Advanced Work Classes 28
- Assignments 32
- Extended Day Kindergarten 42
- Magnet Elementary Schools 73
- Middle Schools 93
- High Schools 102
- Ninth Grade Preferences 118
- Bilingual Assignments 152
- Substantially Separate Assignments 167
- Compliance 170

Staff

- Monitoring Report 185

Special Desegregation

- Overview 198
- Burke and Dorchester High Schools
- East Boston and Umana High Schools
- Tobin School 239
- Other Special Desegregation Schools 263
- Other Minority Students 271
- Humphrey Occupational Resource Center 277

Special Education

- Monitoring Report 341

Bilingual Education

- Monitoring Report 347

Occupational Education

- Monitoring Report 379
- Data Analysis 391

Transportation

- Monitoring Report 435

Facilities

- Monitoring Report 441

Safety and Security

- Monitoring Report 445

Student Discipline

- Monitoring Report 487

Institutional Pairings

- Monitoring Report 511

Parent and Student Organizations

- Monitoring Report 515

Dispute Resolution Report 526

1. Student Assignments

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Analysis of Boston Student Assignments: Overview

The task of monitoring the student assignments in Boston has been carried out under two sections of the Orders of Disengagement: that having to do with the review and approval of actions of the Department of Implementation bearing upon assignments for September 1983, and that having to do with reporting to the Court on the activities of the School Department in twelve areas, including student assignments. In all twelve areas, the Commissioner and Board are reporting on the extent of compliance and the problems found; in that of student assignments, alone, the state's role is more active, and extends to preventing possible non-compliance. If non-compliance is found next Fall, in other words, it will be appropriate to ask why the state approved it in advance!

The reports in the area of student assignments which follow are unusually long and detailed, though not as much so as they could have been. Most of these reports were prepared for the Commissioner at the time that particular actions of the Department of Implementation were before him for approval, and so they reflect the analysis upon which approvals were based. These reports are included here in their original form so that the parties and the public, as well as the Court, can assess the care given and the reasoning followed in assuring that the requirements of the Court were met and the rights of minority students protected. If any errors of analysis were made, they should be easy to identify and to avoid in the future.

These reports are also long and detailed because student assignments represent the heart of a desegregation plan, and warrant the most careful attention. It is important, therefore, to be clear that the analysis of the implementation of student assignments in Boston is by no means complete. In the "procedural manual for monitoring," two objectives were set for the July 15th Report:

> To determine whether all student assignment procedures were
> carried out as required by the April 16th, 1979 Order, as

modified subsequently by the Court.

To estimate the likely extent of compliance with the student desegregation objectives of the May 1975 Plan, as modified by the March 1982 Order.

A further stage of analysis is proposed for the January 15th Report: To determine to what extent the Court-ordered student desegregation objectives have been met.

An extensive range of issues which are barely raised in the present analysis will be the subject of much more extended analysis in the January Report to the Court; this will include the program-by-program and school-by-school applications, assignments, and retention in the Occupational Resource Center, the operation of the application process and preferences to district and magnet schools (apart from the ninth grade), and the retention of minority students in the examination schools. Other areas requiring in-depth analysis will undoubtedly emerge from the response to this July Report itself . . .

Stages of Assignment Monitoring

(1) Extended Day Kindergarten

The decision, by the School Department, to use certain funds made available by the City to expand extended day kindergarten led to a belated request for review and approval by the state. The primary issue arising in the course of this review, as the materials which follow make clear, was whether the location of new programs was disproportionately in schools in predominantly white neighborhoods. Would this result in an unequal burden for minority students? Mr. Coakley provided an extended analysis of each proposed site, and assurances that programs which failed to draw sufficient minority volunteers would not be implemented. On the basis of these explanations and assurances, the expansion was approved.

(2) Space Matrix

The "space matrix" shows how much space will be allocated to each program and to general program purposes in each school, and forms the general context for student assignments though it does not determine them specifically apart from desegregation and other considerations. Analysis of the matrix proposed for 1983-84 assignments concentrated on changes by comparison with the 1982-83 matrix previously approved by the Court. Particular attention was given to bilingual programs. The associate commissioners for occupational and special education and the director of bilingual education were invited to review and react to the proposed matrix with respect to their program areas. After this state-level review process, I discussed each of the proposed changes which seemed to be of significance with Mr. Coakley before recommending that the Commissioner approve the 1983-84 space matrix.

(3) Advanced work classes and examination schools

Admission to these selective programs occurs in three stages: ranked lists (by race/ethnicity) of potential assignees are developed; invitations are extended to appropriate number of students for each school or program, taking into account past experience of the number likely to accept from each group; finally, assignments are made. Mr. Coakley provided detailed documentation, which is included in the report, and gave me the opportunity to review the lists of eligible students with their rankings. As noted above, the actual enrollments of Boston Latin School and (to a lesser extent) Latin Academy show a discouraging rate of attrition of Black and Hispanic students, and as a result a low proportion of such students in the high school grades; this issue warrants closer attention as monitoring continues. The proposed assignments, however, were judged consistent with Court requirements.

(4) Student assignments

Review of proposed assignments was based upon a print-out showing the projected September 1983 enrollment of each school and program (aside from the

Occupational Resource Center). It was necessary to concentrate upon especially significant issues, though future review might well include others. Those selected included assignments to bilingual programs, to substantially-separate programs, to advanced work and extended day kindergarten programs, to high schools (this initial review was greatly extended by a study of the preferences expressed by eighth graders and actual assignments to the ninth grade), to middle schools (time precluded a similar analysis of preferences of fifth graders), and to magnet elementary schools. A detailed analysis (which is included in the report on special desegregation measures) was made of the Tobin School. The distribution of "other minority" students not in bilingual programs at the high school level was the subject of another special analysis. Finally, the extent of apparent "compliance" with the Court-ordered standards was assessed, though cautions were expressed about the impact of assigning present kindergarten students to first grade. On the basis of this review (and of frequent discussions with Mr. Coakley about unclear points) I was able to recommend that the Commissioner approve the assignments.

(5) Humphrey Occupational Resource Center

Proposed assignments to the ORC involved a number of complex questions of analysis. The 1975 Unified Plan set requirements for the assignment process which went beyond consideration of outcome to focus on the process by which students of each racial/ethnic group and each gender would be assigned to places in each program. These requirements, which I helped to draft, reflected the experience with seeking race and sex equity in selective vocational programs statewide, and it was necessary to coordinate the assignment review with an on-going review of the programs which is being carried out by staff of the Division of Occupational Education. Approval of the proposed 1983-84 assignments does not signal that all issues have been resolved or even that all the necessary information is now available, but it does reflect a judgment that the under-enrollment of most programs will make it possible to assign additional students if recruitment results in volunteers. In other words, the present assignments are consistent with Court orders and do not preclude achieving the Court's objectives by Fall.

Summary

I come away from this intensive, though necessarily limited, review of the student assignment process with respect for the integrity with which it is implemented and appreciation for the efforts to provide me with information requested. Perhaps the most serious problem which I have noted has to do with a failure of the school system to take advantage of the considerable flexibility provided by the Plan to recruit students through stressing the choices available. Boston's desegregation plan involves a wide range of options, far more than the general public realizes. Recruitment efforts seem generally perfunctory, whether with respect to vocational programs, to magnet options under-selected by particular racial/ethnic groups, or to "special desegregation" schools.

The Department of Implementation seems to do its best to assign appropriate numbers of students in appropriate racial/ethnic proportions, but this process should be preceded by a lively recruitment effort at the school and district level, and followed by very specific attempts to assure that students newly assigned actually attend their assigned schools. The efforts made, in Boston, when the Haley School opened, when the King School became a magnet, and in other notable cases should become a general practice, which means that recruitment should be by school-level staff who can talk about what they have to offer, and not by press releases or posters from Court Street.

Beyond this general observation, the findings of the assignment analysis are highly particular and must be considered in context. Above all, a number of areas have been identified for further review and discussion with the Department of Implementation.

Charles L. Glenn, Director
June 6th 1983

Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

Charlie Glenn: ✓
OK if B & B
sees no problems.
Jim L.

March 11, 1983

TO: Commissioner

FROM: Charles Glenn Cg.

RE: Review of Boston Student Assignment Provisions

Frank Banks and I met yesterday (March 10th) with John Coakley. Catherine Ellison and Lydia Francis attended part of the meeting, which lasted about four hours. We discussed the following elements of the desegregation plan.

1983-84 Space Matrix

I received a copy of the draft space matrix on March 3rd, with a cover memo from Mr. Coakley specifying the principal areas of change from 1982-83.

On March 4th I discussed the matrix by telephone with Mr. Coakley, and then sent a copy of his memo to Roger Brown, Jim Case, and David Cronin asking their comments, if any, on the provisions affecting their areas of responsibility - by Wednesday March 9th. There were no comments.

Herman Hernandez-Santana of EEO compared the 1983-84 and 1982-83 space matrices line-by-line, and prepared a summary of major changes.

When we met yesterday I reviewed these changes with Mr. Coakley, and satisfied myself that they are in no case significant to desegregation. The only significant bilingual change is the creation of a Cape Verdean program at the Tynan School by dividing that now at the Condon; this population is increasing rapidly. Space has been reserved (but probably will not be used) for Haitian TBE at East Boston High and for Southeast Asian TBE at the McKay and the Mather.

If additional TBE classes are needed in any part of the city, there is ample space available.

Provision for special education space also seems more than adequate. According to Mr. Coakley, 432 classrooms were available for substantially-separate classes in 1982-93, and 445 will be available in 1983-84. Current enrollment is 3,010. At 8 students per class 3,560 places will be available; at 12 students per class this rises to 5,340 places. Budget restrictions are gradually forcing the higher class size; even at the lower class size Boston will be at only 85% utilization.

Knowing that students--and their needs--do not distribute themselves neatly in units of 8 or 12, I might have pursued this space allocation further with our own specialists, but Oliver Lancaster has accepted and supported the space matrix as it relates to bilingual and special education, which are under his jurisdiction (see attached).

A few elements of the matrix--identified in the Coakley memo which I circulated--affect occupational education. Ralph Watson sees no problems with these, nor do I. DOE will of course raise its own program concerns about these changes as a part of the monitoring effort.

Advanced Work Classes

Mr. Coakley had sent me a detailed explanation of the method for determining how many students, of each racial group, to invite to each of twenty-two advanced work classes at each grade level. At our meeting yesterday he provided a detailed analysis of the actual proposed assignments and printout of all the students invited (we declined to keep the printout of names, aside from a sample page, in the interest of protecting confidentiality).

The information and explanations provided were satisfactory.

Examination Schools

Mr. Coakley had also sent me a detailed explanation of the process for determining which students would be invited to the exam schools, and yesterday he provided a further memorandum on this subject, together with a number of printouts of student names and test scores (again, we did not retain the confidential information, apart from sample pages).

The information and explanations provided were satisfactory.

Summary

I explained to Mr. Coakley that I would not be able to consult with you and with legal counsel until next week, and so could not "approve" the space matrix, advanced work class invitations, and examination school invitations.

I told him, however, that he had satisfied my concerns and that I would be recommending that you approve each of these assignment measures.

Note, in that connection, (1) that Boston is on a very tight time schedule on assignments, and is habituated to a rapid "turn-around" from Dr. Dentler, and (2) that in no respect (other than one new bilingual program) do any of these measures represent a significant departure from the 1982-83 arrangements.

Mr. Coakley's rationale for seeking maximum stability this year is the expectation that major changes will occur in 1984-85. As a result, there is little in the measures which we have just reviewed which had not already been approved by the Court.

cc: Frank Banks, Bob Bohn
Bob Blumenthal

Attachments

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

February 28, 1983

MEMORANDUM

To: Charles Glenn

From: John Coakley John Coakley

Subject: Draft of Space Matrix for 1983-84

I am forwarding to you in draft form the Department of Implementation's proposed Space Matrix for 1983-84. This document simultaneously is being forwarded to the Superintendent with the request that he give it prompt attention, review and approval. I will telephone (and write) you when I receive that approval.

It would be most helpful to our efforts to complete the Student Application and Assignment Process by May 1st to May 15th if you would give first priortiy to reviewing the draft matrix in anticipation of my advising you of the Superintendent's approval.

Allow me to alert you to the following:

1. We have tried to identify schools whose assignable capacities may be higher or potentially higher than Court ceilings. These differences have not caused problems in the past.
2. The only major change in bilingual space allocations is one relating to the Cape Verdean Bilingual Program at the Condon School where it will be necessary to split the program between the Condon and Tynan Schools. You will notice that we have "reserved" space in other schools if it becomes necessary to split other programs. However, it is not our present intent to assign students to "reserve" spaces; we would so advise you if it were our intent.
3. We have tried to make only minimal changes (i.e., space transfers) in Special Needs space allocations. (On a gross basis there will be more space available in 1983-84 for special needs; I estimate that there will be a 55%-60% utilization of such space.) We are reluctant to move programs in 1983-84 because we expect major school, program and district changes to occur in 1984-85.

4. The school system plans to introduce an international high school program at grade 9 in 1983-84. The Space Matrix does not "speak" to this plan, but can accommodate the plan in several ways. We will advise you formally of such a plan.

5. The school system does not plan to invite prospective ninth-graders to the Cooperative Vocational Education Program (Machine Shop) at East Boston High School. The Space Matrix does reflect the lowered capacity. The program is duplicative of an offering at Hyde Park High School.

6. There is no change in the capacity of the Cooperative Vocational Education Program at Dorchester High School. However, Mr. Caradonio is re-utilizing the space to phase out Upholstering, lower the enrollment in Woodworking and introduce an Urban Retrofit Component.

7. Dorchester High School has petitioned for a citywide Health Careers Program in conjunction with the Humphrey Center. If approved by the Superintendent, the program can be accommodated at the school consistent with the space allocations in the Matrix.

In summary, I hope to be asking you within a very few days to approve the Space Matrix for 1983-84 (once I obtain the Superintendent's support). When I make my request (or within a week thereafter) I will be advising you of possible program changes noted above in items 4 and 7. We in the Department of Implementation then can move to complete our assignment matrices and decision tables. These latter tools have not been subject to Court approval but are the devices by which we "individualize" the Student Applications so that we can portray on each student's application (if he is a current BPS student) the exact schools and programs available for his consideration.

I am attempting in each letter to be as informative as possible, and expect that you will call me if you have questions.

JC:ab
Enclosure

xc: Franklin Banks
Catherine Ellison

DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
MAR 03 1983
BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

[illegible]
[illegible]
DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT [illegible]
OLIVER W. LANCASTER

Copies to
CE/LF/KB/JC/[illegible]
[illegible]

March 3, 1983

MEMORANDUM

To: John Coakley

From: Oliver W. Lancaster OL

Subject: SPACE MATRIX - 1983-84

Well done! I appreciate the adjustments you entered in the March 1 document. While the component is not reflective of all requests by the Department of Special Services, I do agree that some issues are better addressed in a larger context and that the 1984-85 school year might be more appropriate than the present. There is no doubt in my mind that outstanding issues will be addressed amicably and responsibly.

I fully recognize the difficulty (should I substitute impossibility) of maintaining a schedule and truly responding to clients and constituencies. Someone must call closure, and I respect that.

In closing, I support the Space Matrix of March 1 as it relates to Special Education and the Transitional Bilingual Program. Your responsiveness and patience is acknowledged, and your candor is appreciated. Nice job!

[illegible] COURT STREET BOSTON, [illegible]

Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

March 4th 1983

TO: Roger Brown, Jim Case, David Cronin

FROM: Charles Glenn

Important!

RE: Boston "Space Matrix" for 1983-84

I attach a memo received yesterday from John Coakley; he attached an extensive document which I have not copied, but which is available in my office in a notebook together with the corresponding document applicable to 1982-83, for comparison purposes.

These "space matrices" show how much space will be allocated for each program in each Boston school. The Court has traditionally reviewed and approved these arrangements before student assignments are made, since they obviously affect the number of students of each racial category who can be assigned to each school.

John has assured me by telephone, as in the memo, that the changes this year compared with last are minimal. He tells me, today, that (1) the superintendent has approved the space matrix, and (2) Oliver Lancaster has approved the special education aspects, which were somewhat in question.

Frank Banks and I will meet with John Thursday morning to go over the matrix and to raise any objections which the state might have. Since I will be in Washington through Wednesday, you should communicate your concerns to Frank and he will pass them along to me and to John.

I have asked Herman Hernandez-Santana of EEO to go over the matrices for this year and next, noting any instances in which the capacity of programs are changed. He will be working with the notebook, but any of your staff who would like to consult it should do so; his analysis should make it simple to identify the changes, if any.

John Coakley's memo may provide all of the information which you will require to determine whether there is an issue with the space allocations.

I'm sorry to rush you on this, but the assignment process has very tight deadlines, and inevitably we are slower than Dr. Dentler, who had years of experience and no need to consult program considerations! Frank will need your comments by Wednesday if they are to be shared with John on Thursday. We will prepare a written response to space matrix Friday.

cc. Bob Blumenthal, Bob Bohn, Frank Banks

John H. Lawson, Commissioner of Education
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

March 22, 1983

Dr. Robert R. Spillane
Superintendent of Schools
Boston Public Schools
26 Court Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Dear Dr. Spillane:

I am writing with respect to the 1983-84 space matrix, examination school invitations, and advanced work class assignments.

John Coakley of your Department of Implementation provided Charles Glenn of my staff with extensive information about each of these matters. They met on March 10 for an extended discussion, at the conclusion of which Dr. Glenn's questions had all been answered satisfactorily.

On the basis of this review, you have my approval to implement the space matrix, the examination school invitations, and the advanced work class invitations, as outlined for Dr. Glenn.

Sincerely yours,

John H. Lawson
Commissioner of Education

JHL:ek

cc: Dr. Charles Glenn ✓

Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

March 29th 1983

TO: John Coakley

FROM: Charles Glenn CG.

RE: Copley Square High School

I have received materials supportive of a program change at Copley Square High School, to designate it as a school of international studies.

This program change was not among the considerations included in the review of the 1983-84 space matrix, and it is not clear to me on the basis of information presently available whether it would in fact constitute a modification of existing assignment orders. If it does, of course, it would have to be discussed with all of the parties.

I take it that we have not been asked to "review and approve" this program change, but have simply been provided with information pending a decision by the Boston School Committee.

cc. Robert Blumenthal, Esq.
Franklin Banks

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
John R. Coakley, Senior Officer

February 23, 1983

Dr. Charles Glenn
Equal Education Opportunities
Massachusetts Dept. of Education
1585 Hancock Street
Quincy, MA 02169

Dear Charles,

Each year we in the Department of Implementation set a goal (or desired number) for incoming grades of the three Examination Schools. We then add to each goal a percentage in excess of the desired number for each grade and school to arrive at a total number of invitations.

We arrive at the goal for incoming grades by analyzing each school's total capacity (i.e., room count) in relation to the present enrollment promoted a grade. (You may be aware that separately we do a grade-by-grade, program-by-program enrollment projection yearly for each school.) Each year the three Headmasters are advised of our goals and asked to agree or disagree. The Headmasters of Boston Latin Academy and Technical High School agreed with this year's goals. The Headmaster of Boston Latin School asked us to increase the grade nine goal by 30 and we did so.

The percentage in excess is determined by studying the acceptance rate for each grade and school in previous years.

From at least 1978 to 1981 Dr. Scott was the primary monitor of this particular process. In 1982 Dr. Dentler did the monitoring. They were aware of our approach and did not reject it.

It is our intent this year to set the following goals and offer the following numbers of invitations:

School/Grade	Goal	Percentage in Excess	Number to be Invited
BLA, gr.7	240	25%	300
BLA, gr. 9	60	67%	100
BLS, gr. 7	420	20%	500
BLS, gr. 9	90	25%	113
Tech, gr. 9	500	50%	750*
Tech, gr. 10	150	40%	210**

*Last year, we set the same goal but could only "find" 622 to invite.
**Last year, we set the same goal but could only "find" 53 to invite.

The Headmaster of Technical High School has been seeking publicity and parental support for his school. I have advised him that, within reason, we would invite more than 750 students to his 9th grade and 210 for his tenth grade this year if indeed there were such eligible (i.e., above the 50th percentile) candidates.

I offer you the following historical data as justification for the numbers of invitations we intend to offer:

Invitations-Acceptances-Ratios (I-A-R)

	I - A - R 5/79			I - A - R 5/81			I - A - R 5/82			I - A - R "5/83"		
BLA, gr 7	329	259	79%	313	220	70%	380	312	82%	300	240	80%
BLA, gr 9	100	60	60%	108	50	46%	144	85	59%	100	60	60%
BLS, gr 7	540	474	88%	517	452	87%	517	439	85%	500	420	84%
BLS, gr 9	99	70	71%	108	69	64%	108	84	78%	113	90	80%
Tech,gr 9	605	405	67%	747	347	46%	622	267	43%	650*	390	60%
Tech,gr 10	57	47	82%	68	49	72%	53	34	64%	65*	40	65%

*Subjective estimates

Thus far, we haven't mentioned desegregation. Well, at this point we turn to the ground rules laid down in the several Court Orders. I would refer you to pp 27-28 of our Procedural Manual. We follow those rules scrupulously; in fact, they really are computerized and the results flow automatically. For example, last year we submitted the following numbers for approval (given) by the Court Expert. (It would be our intent to provide you with a comparable proposal sometime between March 1st and March 15th).

	Goal	Invitations	(Group A*	Group B)
BLA, gr. 7	330	380	(133	247)
BLA, gr. 9	120	144	(51	93)
BLS, gr. 7	450	517	(179	338)
BLS, gr. 9	90	108	(38	70)
Tech, gr. 7	500	622	(200	422)
Tech, gr. 9	150	53	(23	30)

*Group A represents Black and Hispanic students; Group B represents all other students.

One might think that the above invitations do not guarantee acceptances at the desired rates for Group A and Group B, but they tend to do so each year. Alow me to show the following acceptances in the "new" grades of the three schools:

Initial *Acceptances

		Group A	Group B	Total	Group A/Total
6/82	BLA, gr. 7	123	190	313	39%
	BLS, gr. 7	164	275	439	37%
	Tech, gr. 9	131	137	268	49%
6/81	BLA, gr. 7	96	135	231	42%
	BLS, gr. 7	155	288	443	35%
	Tech, gr. 9	184	183	367	50%
6/80	BLA, gr. 7	110	203	313	35%
	BLS, gr. 7	138	322	460	30%
	Tech, gr. 9	195	231	426	46%
6/79	BLA, gr. 7	104	160	264	39%
	BLS, gr. 7	106	371	477	22%
	Tech, gr. 9	201	271	472	43%

*We do allow some students to accept invitations after June of a year.

When we furnish you with our proposed numbers of Group A and Group B invitations for each grade and school we will be prepared to have you inspect our printouts at this office and to examine our calculations. In the years 1978 to 1981 Dr. Scott asked for a variety of analyses before furnishing his approval. It is my recollection that Dr. Dentler in 1982 was not interested in the various charts but based his approval on the Group A/Group B invitations. He did ask specific questions about the low numbers at Technical High School and about the Group A Ratio at grade 9 of Boston Latin School.

I offer this preview and overview in the hope that you will think through the issue and possibly ask questions before the fact of our actually developing the invitation lists. I would be willing to discuss this topic at length or respond in writing to you. I also would be willing to take the data (e.g., printouts, etc.) of 1982 or an earlier year and do a "dry run" for you.

Incidentally, we have only one round of invitations because (a) the process is so prolonged and (b) it confuses the issue too greatly when we reach the regular Student Application/Assignment Process.

Sincerely,

John R. Coakley
Senior Officer

JC:ab

xc: Franklin Banks
Catherine Ellison

Examination Schools - Entrance - Fact Sheet

1. Invitations should be issued on or about March 15th

2. How Many apply?
   In a typical year, 2100 apply for seventh grade seats at Boston Latin School and/or Boston Latin Academy, 1500 for ninth grade seats at Boston Latin School and/or Boston Latin Academy and/or Boston Technical, and 100 for tenth grade seats at Boston Technical.

3. How many are invited?
   The numbers invited vary somewhat from year to year, dependent on the existing enrollment minus potential graduates. This year we will invite about 800 students to the seventh grades at one of the two Latins, about 180 to the ninth grades at one of the two Latins, between 650 and 750 to the ninth grade at Tech, and 50 to 75 to the tenth grade at Tech. (The number of invitations this year to the Latins will be slightly lower because we are finally paying the price for large invitations to the schools every year since 1978.)

4. Do you have more than one round of invitations?
   No, the above invitations take into consideration the recent acceptance rates at the several grades of the Examination Schools. Last year, for example, the acceptance rate of BLS invitations was 84%, of BLA invitations 76%, and of Technical invitations 45%.

5. If the Schools are "Examination" Schools why isn't the "SSAT" test the sole determinant of a student's ranking for invitation?
   It is generally agreed that a test such as the SSAT should be combined with at least another determinant such as recent report card scores to rank students properly for invitation.

6. What determinants are used by the Boston Public Schools?
   We "mix" the three SSAT scores (Reading, Verbal and Quantitative) with a student's Grade Point Average (GPA). The GPA is based on a student's report grades in the first half of the current school year in arithmetic and English. A student is given a composite grading between 12 and 0 by his school. In simplified terms, a 12 might correspond to an A+ and a 9 to a B+ and a 6 to a C+.

7. How do you "mix" the SSAT and GPA for each student?
   We use an equation which was provided to us by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) in Princeton, New Jersey. That equation or formula was updated by ETS a few years ago by studying the final grades of Examination Schools' students who at the time were in grades seven and nine.

8. How many equations or formulae are there?
   There is one for BLA, grade seven and one for BLS, grade seven, one for both Latins (no difference), grade nine and one for both grades at Technical. At the grade seven level, the formulae have the effect of giving slightly greater weight to the quantitative SSAT score for the BLS ranking and a slightly greater weight to the reading and verbal SSAT scores for the BLA ranking. All four equations or formulae incorporate the student's GPA in a very signifcant way.

9. What do you consider to be good SSAT and GPA scores?

"Good" is a relative word -- from year to year, dependent on the grade of application and the preferred school. It's safe to say that a student with SSAT scores over 300 each and a GPA over 10, is in a "good" position. For the two Latins, it is likely that a student with SSAT scores below 270 AND a GPA below 8 is not in a "good" position. It is much, much too difficult to conjecture about the great middle grouping of students who may have all kinds of combinations of quantitative, verbal and reading SSAT scores with varying GPAs.

10. Are there any other indications of one's chances for an invitation?

Well, there's a negative indication. If a student ranks in the lower fiftieth percent of students applying for a specific grade of a specific examination school, he or she will not be invited -- even if there are vacancies. For example, last year only 105 students applied for grade ten at Technical High School. Although we gladly would have been willing to assign up to 225 to that school's tenth grade, we could only invite half (53) of the 105 students who actually applied.

11. How do public school applicants fare against private school applicants?

Here is a general picture of last year's applicants:

	From BPS	From Non-BPS	Total
Applicants	2088	1748	3836
Invitees	959	866	1825
Acceptances (as of 6/82)	820	401	1221
Invitees by School			
BLS	314	312	626
BLA	276	248	524
Tech	369	306	675
Acceptances by School			
BLS	301	222	523
BLA	267	130	395
Tech	252	49	301

12. Why does the process take so long and why so secretive?

The SSAT is "taken" in November; the GPAs cannot (and should not) be determined until late January and February. The processing and cross-checking of GPAs, the matching of a GPA to each SSAT score, and the Court (or now State) review of the assignments occur in a six-week period.

We are not consciously secretive but we are aggressively scrupulous in trying to protect the rights of applicants. We do everything possible to give every, single eligible student a fair chance. That means we must run "checks" to verify that students themselves took the SSAT tests, that they reside in the city, that they are in the proper grade and that they are neither penalized nor "given a leg up" by their GPAs. Every effort is made to insure that no person gains for his/her child (or student) what we would consider unfair or improper entry into an Examination School.

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
John R. Coakley, Senior Officer

March 10, 1983

MEMORANDUM

TO: Charles Glenn

FROM: John Coakley John Coakley

SUBJECT: Invitations to Examination Schools

It is our intent to issue invitations to the Examination Schools in accordance with the Federal Court Orders and related assignment procedures in effect since at least 1979. Please reference my recent memorandum of February 23, 1983 wherein we indicate our practice of inviting more students than we expect to enroll.

Specifically, we intend to invite the following numbers of students:

	Group A*	Group B**	Total
Boston Latin Academy, Grade 7	106	194	300
Boston Latin Academy, Grade 9	35	65	100
Boston Latin School, Grade 7	175	327	502
Boston Latin School, Grade 9	39	75	114
Technical High School, Grade 9	220	493	718
Technical High School, Grade 10	31	22	53
TOTAL	606	1181	1787

*Group A = Black and Hispanic Students
**Group B = White and Any Other Students

In previous years, we provided the following comparable data to the Court Expert:

Lowest Ranked Applicant Invited

	Group A	Group A	Group B	Group B
	List 1	List 2	List 1	List 2
BLA, Grade 7	941	0	564	0
BLA, Grade 9	488	0	159	0
BLS, Grade 7	1051	414	435	0
BLS, Grade 9	430	0	94	0
TECH, Grade 9	722	722	719	722
TECH, Grade 10	57		57	

Note: Group A = Black and Hispanic Students
Group B = White and Any Other Students
List 1 = Combination of SSAT and GPA
List 2 = SSAT only

Analysis of Invitees by Percentages

	Group A	Group B
BLA, Grade 7	35%	65%
BLA, Grade 9	35%	65%
SUB-TOTAL BLA	35%	65%
BLS, Grade 7	35%	65%
BLS, Grade 9	34%	66%
SUB-TOTAL BLS	35%	65%
TECH, Grade 9	31%	69%
TECH, Grade 10	58%	42%
SUB-TOTAL TECH	33%	67%
TOTAL	34%	66%

Our plan of action is to mail the invitations (and scores/rankings) to students on March 11th or March 12th and to deliver invitation rosters to the three Examination Schools on March 14th. We will try to obtain replies by March 28th. However, we will be receptive to late acceptances through next September.

mm
cc: Franklin Banks
Catherine Ellison
Lydia Francis
John Canty

3/10/83

Addendum

Invitees for 1983-84

	Black	White	Oriental	Hispanic	Indian American	Total
BLA, 7	90	182	12	16	0	300
BLA, 9	33	54	11	2	0	100
BLS, 7	139	275	52	36	0	502
BLS, 9	34	66	9	5	0	114
TECH, 9	176	423	73	44	2	718
TECH, 10	25	8	13	6	1	53
TOTAL	497	1008	170	109	3	1787

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
John R. Coakley, Senior Officer

May 13, 1983

MEMORANDUM

To: Charles Glenn

From: John Coakley John Coakley

Subject: Analysis of Examination Schools' Acceptances for 83-84

I - Overview

	Goal	Invited	Accepted	Ratio (A/I)	Ratio (A/G)
BLA, 7	240	300	221	73.7%	92.1%
BLA, 9	60	100	55	55.0%	91.7%
BLS, 7	420	502	430	85.7%	102.4%
BLS, 9	90	114	62	54.4%	68.9%
Tech, 9	500	718	331	46.1%	66.2%
Tech, 10	150	53	43	81.1%	28.7%
TOTAL	1460	1787	1142	63.9%	78.2%

II - By Racial Groups

	Invited		Accepted		Ratio (A/I)	
	Group A	Group B	Group A	Group B	A	B
BLA, 7	106	194	86	135	81.1%	69.6%
BLA, 9	35	65	25	30	71.4%	46.2%
BLS, 7	175	327	147	283	84.0%	86.5%
BLS, 9	39	75	24	38	61.5%	50.7%
Tech, 9	220	498	154	177	70.0%	35.5%
Tech, 10	31	22	23	20	74.2%	90.9%
TOTAL	606	1181	459	683	75.7%	57.8%

ab

xc: Franklin Banks
Catherine Ellison
John Canty
Lydia Francis

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

February 23, 1983

Mr. Charles P. Glenn
Equal Education Opportunities
Massachusetts Department of Education
1585 Hancock Street
Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

Dear Charles:

This letter concerns our impending invitations to the Advanced Work Class/Academically Talented Program (grades 4, 5 and 6) for 1983-84. It seems appropriate to alert you to the process we follow each year.

In November our own Boston Public School students in grades 3, 4 and 5 are administered the Metropolitan Achievement Tests in Reading and Arithmetic as part of the regular testing program. On a nearby Saturday in November non-Boston Public School students in the same grades are allowed to take the same tests at Boston Latin School. Incidentally, Spanish-speaking students in Bilingual Education also are tested by a separate instrument.

On or about March 15th, the tests having been scored and students given a composite score, students who took the test are placed in rank order by grade, by district and by racial/ethnic group (i.e., Black, White, Other Minority). As you can understand, we have many lists: 27 for 9 middle schools, 66 for the two-grade elementary schools, one for the Spanish Bilingual ATP at the middle school level and two for the Spanish Bilingual AWC at the elementary school level.

Our space allocation for the programs really has not changed from year to year. As a rule, an elementary school has a two-grade total capacity of 40, and a middle school has a one-grade capacity of 50. An examination of past Space Matrices and our impending Space Matrix will verify the relatively unchanging capacities in the AWC/ATP.

Having set our capacities (or re-stated them), we now determine what the desired racial/ethnic composition of each school's program should be in 1983-84. This poses a minor problem for us. On the one hand we need to set "tentative" racial/ethnic percentage goals for 1983-84 in order to do the necessary planning for student assignments. On the other hand we want to defer the decreeing of "definitive" racial/ethnic percentage goals to the latest time possible because we must "abide" by those percentage goals throughout 1983-84. Accordingly, the percentage goals which we list below are based on an analysis of enrollments on January 25, 1983 and should be viewed as "tentative" or "working" goals. We will not set "definitive" goals until late March or April. This should not be a problem because (a) few of the percentages will change much between January and March/April and (b) for AWC/ATP invitations we try to adhere to ideal percentages and keep away from the high-low extremes.

There follows are proposed plan of action:

I. Tentative or Working Racial/Ethnic Percentage Goals for 1983-84

DISTRICT	ELEMENTARY	MIDDLE
I	29%-19%-52%	28%-25%-47%
II	43%-21%-36%	43%-21%-36%
III	62%-29%-9%	57%-36%-7%
IV	73%-22%-5%	71%-26%-3%
V	68%-15%-17%	66%-20%-14%
VI	37%-37%-26%	37%-43%-20%
VII	40%-15%-45%	40%-20%-40%
VIII	2%-83%-15%	2%-87%-11%
IX	52%-22%-26%	51%-27%-22%
BILINGUAL	0%-0%-100%	0%-0%-100%

II. Proposed Capacity/Invitations to Grade 4, AWC

DISTRICT	SCHOOL	CAPACITY	INVITATIONS
I	FARRAGUT	12-8-20=40	14-10-26=50
II	ELLIS	17-9-14=40	26-13-22=61
III	LEE	25-12-3=40	31-15-5=51
IV	TAYLOR	29-9-2=40	37-11-3=51
V	MATHER	14-3-3=20	17-4-4=25
	MURPHY	27-6-7=40	34-8-9=51
VI	DEVER	15-15-10=40	20-20-14=54
VII	QUINCY	16-6-18=40	18-7-19=44
VIII	BRADLEY	1-16-3=20	1-21-4=26
IX	GUILD	10-5-5=20	13-6-7=26
	HENNIGAN	21-9-10=40	26-11-13=50
BILINGUAL	HENNIGAN	0-0-20=20	0-0-35=35

III. Proposed Capacity/Invitations to Grade 5, AWC

DISTRICT	SCHOOL	CAPACITY	CURRENT GRADE 4	NEW INVITES	TOTAL INVITATIONS
I	FARRAGUT	12-8-20=40	9-2-7=18	5-8-19=32	14-10-26=50
II	ELLIS	17-9-14=40	15-4-1=20	7-7-17=31	22-11-18=51
III	LEE	25-12-3=40	25-11-1=37	3-2-3=8	28-13-4=45
IV	TAYLOR	29-9-2=40	26-10-1=37	7-0-2=9	33-10-3=46
V	MATHER	14-3-3=20	13-5-3=21	3-0-1=4	17-4-4=25
	MURPHY	27-6-7=40	27-8-1=36	7-0-8=15	34-8-9=51
VI	DEVER	15-15-10=40	15-9-7=31	5-11-7=23	20-20-14=54
VII	QUINCY	16-6-18=40	15-5-21=41	2-1-0=3	17-6-21=44
VIII	BRADLEY	1-16-3=20	0-17-3=20	2-2-2=6	2-19-5=26
IX	GUILD	10-5-5=20	12-7-4=23	0-0-2=2	12-6-7=25
	HENNIGAN	21-9-10=40	15-14-4=33	8-0-5=13	23-14-9=46
BILINGUAL	HENNIGAN	0-0-20=20	0-0-5=5	0-0-30=30	0-0-35=35

IV. Proposed Capacity/Invitations to Grade 6, ATP

DISTRICT	SCHOOL	CAPACITY	CURRENT GRADE ~~6~~ 5	NEW INVITES	TOTAL INVITATIONS
I	EDISON	14-13-24=51	8-5-10=23	9-10-18=37	17-15-28=60
II	M. CURLEY	22-11-18=51	19-8-5=32	7-5-17=29	26-13-22=61
III	IRVING	29-18-4=51	23-14-2=39	11-8-2=21	34-22-4=60
IV	THOMPSON	36-13-2=51	24-8-0=32	29-11-3=43	53-19-3=75
V	HOLMES	50-15-11=76	42-16-4=62	17-2-9=28	59-18-13=90
VI	McCORMACK	19-22-10=51	13-13-6=32	9-13-6=28	22-26-12=60
VII	TIMILTY	20-10-20=50	16-6-19=41	8-6-5=19	24-12-24=60
VIII	BARNES	1-23-2=26	0-13-3=6	1-17-1=19	1-30-4=35
IX	KING	26-14-11=51	26-15-12=53	9-4-3=16	35-19-15=69
BILINGUAL	MACKEY	0-0-20=20	0-0-11=11	0-0-15=15	0-0-26=26

We adhere to the thrust of page 24 of the Department of Implementation's Procedural Manual. We prefer to have one round of invitations for the same reasons offered in my letter concerning the Examination Schools.

The creation of the eligibility lists is much less dificult than that for the Examination Schools (with their formulae for "mixing" Secondary School Admission Test scores and Grade Point Averages). The existence of so many lists is rather awkward and, further, students' scores/ranks tend to be grouped together more tightly. Again, I would prefer to hear from you before the fact and am available to meet with you and share historical data. Dr. Dentler reviewed the process in 1982, and Dr. Scott in the prior years.

Sincerely,

John R. Coakley

John R. Coakley
Senior Officer

bmj

cc: Catherine Ellison
Franklin Banks

Office of the Commissioner
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

May 6, 1983

Dr. Robert R. Spillane
Superintendent of Schools
Boston Public Schools
26 Court Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Dear Dr. Spillane:

We have completed our review of proposed assignments for 1983-84, based upon projected grade-by-grade enrollments for each school provided to us on April 28, 1983. We have also reviewed Attorney Larry Johnson's objections to my earlier approval of the 1983-84 space matrix, as contained in plaintiffs' May 4, 1983 filing with the Court.

The proposed assignments are consistent with Orders of the Court governing student assignments. On behalf of the Board of Education I approve the assignments, and especially commend the efforts made to desegregate Burke and Dorchester High Schools.

We will share our supporting analysis with the Department of Implementation by memorandum.

Please note that my approval of 1983-84 assignments does not include assignments to the Humphrey Occupational Resource Center, since we have not yet received projected enrollments.

Sincerely,

John H. Lawson

John H. Lawson
Commissioner of Education

JHL/Gl

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
John R. Coakley, Senior Officer

received at 26 Court St
Thursday 930 Am
April 28th CG

April 28, 1983

MEMORANDUM

To: Charles Glenn

From: John Coakley John Coakley

Subject: Proposed Initial Assignments for 1983-84

As you know, we completed the Student Assignment Process (exclusive of ORC) on April 27th. Enclosed please find our proposed initial assignments for 1983-84. You will find the following separate printouts:

1. Total Assigned, by School, Grade, Race
2. Substantially Separate Students, by School and Race
3. Extended Day Program, by School and Race
4. Advanced Work Class, by School, Grade, Race
5. Bilingual Education, by School, Grade and Race

You will find that the printouts contain what we call "dirty data", (e.g., a fourth-grader in the Extended Day Program for kindergarteners). We will correct some of the errors before assignments are issued, but predictably we will have to do some correcting after assignments. This is normal operating procedure.

You also will find that the "narrow" printouts do not contain separate percentages for kindergarten and for grades 1 to 5.

I have compared the assignments with last year's initial assignments (June 4, 1982) which were approved personally by Judge Garrity and find them quite similar regarding percentages. If anything, the percentages for high schools are "better" this year.

26 COURT STREET, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108 • 726-6200 EXT. 5500, 726-6555, EXT. 5500 AREA 617

We would like to be able to start printing the notices on Friday afternoon to take advantage of the week-end availability of the computer. Otherwise, during the regular work week -- in fairness to the many priorities in the system -- we would be obliged to do the printing over a period of several nights.

JC:ab
Enclosures

xc: Robert Spillane
Franklin Banks

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

April 8, 1983

Mr. Charles Glenn
Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education
1385 Hancock Street
Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

Dear Charles:

I am responding to your March 24th memorandum, 1983 Student Assignments. You raised three sets of questions, and I will try to comment on each set.

#1. We process "New-to-Boston" applications at the same time we process the applications of our own (K to grade 11) students. During the assignment period it has not been our practice to distinguish between the two kinds of applications. Of course, the rules programmed into our computer give "present school" guarantees to many of our current students, and such guarantees cannot be given to new applicants. On the other hand, the "community district school" rights for kindergarten through grade eight apply equally to current students and prospective students.

Each winter I provide the school system with projected enrollments for the following mid December, but, such enrollments are not made on a racial basis, nor are they intended to be goals. We do not attempt to set enrollment goals for each school during the Assignment Process.

At assignment time we adhere faithfully (some would say "rigidly") to programmatic and grade-by-grade capacities (which are refinements of the Space Matrix) in magnet elementary and middle schools, and such capacities or sub-capacities will be determined by race, except for Bilingual Education and Substantially Separate Special Education. John Canty and Carl Nickerson develop these sub-capacities which are "translated" by Jack Yessayan of Record Management Unit (you may recall one of the Advanced Work working printouts).

Given the "present school" or "community district school" rights of students, we do not set regular-education sub-capacities by grade or by race in the elementary and middle schools of the community districts. Thus far, we seldom encounter overcrowding but can encounter desegregation issues. However, I need not dwell on the mathematical problems of computing racial/ethnic percentage goals for a district based on the public school residents of a district, including the District IX attendees.

At the high school level, we set capacities and sub-capacities and adhere faithfully to them at Umana, Copley and Boston High Schools and, last year, at English and Madison Park High Schools. However, the complexity of attaining desegregation at the latter two schools and seeking it at all of the community district high schools sometimes require our going over capacities. (Dr. Dentler, I am certain, will attest to my claim.) Almost certainly we will exceed the Court Capacity of West Roxbury High School and possibly at Brighton High School. We will not reach capacity at East Boston High School and predictably will not reach capacity at Charlestown, Burke and Dorchester High Schools.

Relative to non-promotions, we do not factor in non-promotions. We "promote" everyone at assignment-time, then "de-promote" some students on July 1st and re-assign a portion of those students who presently are in grades 5 or 8, and then "re-promote" some of the "de-promoted" students before Labor Day (and "re-assign" any of such transitional grade students to their Assignment (i.e., May 1st) schools. The process, detailed in an administrative notice, was presented originally to the Experts and accepted by them, possibly with a lack of enthusiasm (although with no counter-recommendation either). Although the gross number of non-promotions is similar from year to year, the variation from school to school each year can be great. For example, a new principal can "change" the results or a collective "assault" on standards can alter the results. Further, some schools "fail" students in June and, even when students do not go to summer school, reconsider their decisions in September or even in December.

The above response may not seem responsive to you; it explains my tardiness in replying to you. We follow the Court-approved procedures which I have excerpted and enclosed. (The excerpt does not speak to Court-ordered priorities/guarantees or recent commitments on Dorchester/Burke High Schools.) If we do not like the results, particularly at the high school level, we may alter sub-capacities or use high-low racial ranges (rather than ideal racial goals) to obtain different results--usually ones with better racial/ethnic percentages, although sometimes at the expense of Court Capacities. In essence, we may spend up to a week, after the first results, analyzing, modifying and doing further "runs" before we make a presentation to you.

#2. Candidly, I do not think the outreach efforts at Dorchester and Burke High Schools will be dramatically better. (Also, I cannot at this time state what efforts were made at the two schools. I can tell you of our own citywide efforts and of my directives to school-level officals.) The schools ARE better this year AND the leaders are really trying, but perceptions die slowly and demographic changes continue in the district. Please compare:

Initial Assignments (Court Approved) of 1982-83 6/4/82

	Black	White	Other
Burke High	78%	13%	9%
Dorchester High	73%	16%	11%

Current Assignments in 1982-83 3/24/83

	Black	White	Other
Burke High	82%	10%	8%
Dorchester High	74%	14%	12%

Now, one may look at the comparison and think that the change has been minimal. However, I see regression because I can testify from personal knowledge, using your Bible and mine, that a total of one white student from District V--repeat, ONE--has been allowed to go to a high school other than Burke or Dorchester since June 6, 1982. I, personally, have examined every assignment or transfer request for District V residents this year, and have granted one medical ("traumatic") assignment to Madison Park High School.

I personally assured Judge Garrity in chamber that the June 6th assignments to Burke and Dorchester for 1982-83 were such that:

- no new white students from District V were assigned to Umana, Boston, English, Madison or the Vocational/Business Educational Programs except the Vocational Education Program at Dorchester High School itself, and
- no new white students from District V except the Wheatley 8th graders were assigned to Copley.

I repeat to you that since June 6, 1982 no white student from District V, except the one noted above, received an assignment other than Burke or Dorchester or received a transfer out of the two schools. Now, there were a small number of late acceptances to Technical High School and there may have been a few "readmitted" students (to other schools) who, by a five-year practice, are assigned to their last school of attendance if they attended it within two years. (Ironically, the purpose of that practices is to discourage a student who for example, otherwise might drop out of English High School and a month or so later try to gain entrance to West Roxbury High School.) Despite the usual pressures, we adhered strictly to our commitment. An independent auditor, with computer expertise, could verify what we did.

The point of this litany is to tell you not to expect too much on racial improvements at the two schools. Primarily, it is a "problem" of continuing in-migration of minorities, but Dorchester still is experiencing white out-migration. Relative to other schools, I am of the view that the Court considers them in compliance. We do everything possible to obtain the goals for each school within the requirements of the Court Orders and without indulging in false advertising (i.e., offering options we have no intention to even consider). The Court Order of 1975 and the later actions of the Court and Experts clearly obliged us to articulate to parents the many details of the Assignment Plan, including options and preferences. Although, we could not make promises that every applicant would receive a preferred school, it seems to me that we had the legal, ethical and moral obligation to consider the preferences. See page 71 of the 1975 Court Order: "The admission process will attempt to honor these indicated preferences." Some learned philosopher, theologian or psychiatrist will have to tell me some day why I sometimes feel I have violated ethical standards in an attempt to carry out Court Orders flowing from the law of the land.

#3. You use the term "projected enrollments," and I don't know how to answer your first question in item #3. I will try to give you, BEFORE we complete the "assigned enrollments," a breakdown of PREFERENCES by order, grade and race. (If I also can obtain that data by "present school" BEFORE the fact I will do so, but that is not guaranteed.)

The chief anomalies will be the balancing of the priorities of Court Capacities and Racial Goals at the high school level.

Another need would predictably be some flexibility in assigning kindergarteners. For example, at Application Time we probably will be oversubscribed by white applicants to the James Curley Kindergarten and undersubscribed by minority applicants. We would propose to assign whites up to the "white capacity" for the program, assign available minority children to the Kindergarten and leave the empty seats for minority applicants only who will come in during the summer. This situation occurs at Ohrenberger, Guild and McKay Schools too. (Last year, we had registered only 2000 kindergarteners, 54% white, at Assignment Time; now the enrollment is 4500, 40% white.)

Each year we anticipate--not always correctly--what will be asked of us, and we're usually prepared to tell the Court Expert or you what the realities were/are for schools such as the Stone, Lewis, Thompson. It might help if you and I agreed beforehand on possible schools of concern.

If you would like to meet I'd be glad to do so.

Sincerely,

John Coakley

John R. Coakley

Enclosure
cc: Franklin Banks

Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

March 24th 1983

TO: John Coakley

FROM: Charles Glenn CG.

RE: 1983 Student Assignments

I would like to be able to review the 1983 proposed assignments very efficiently, in order to make it possible for you to send out these assignments as early as possible. You will appreciate, of course, that this review must be thorough and careful, and that this will be my first time (since 1974!) reviewing Boston assignments.

The advance information which you provided me about the examination schools and the advanced work classes was extremely helpful. By raising questions about assignments at this time I hope to give you the chance to assure that I have the necessary information when the proposed assignments are ready.

(1) Will you be able to provide me with information on newly assignable students, in addition to the projected enrollments which will result from those assignments? Looking only at the outcomes obscures the decisions which have lead to those outcomes. For example, could you indicate, for each school, the projected enrollment based upon promotions, and then the number of students new to the school whom you expect to assign, by race? Presumably some such step must occur in the process, to avoid exceeding capacities as well as to seek compliance with the desegregation standards.

(2) What can we anticipate will be the results of recruitment and other special measures upon the Burke and Dorchester High schools, and other schools which are not currently in compliance with the Court's standard? How will the projected enrollments be affected by the decisions made during the assignment process?

(3) What else would it be useful for me to know about before the projected enrollments are available? Can you anticipate apparent anomalies which are likely to require discussion, so that we can discuss them before rather than after the assignments are ready?

I would be glad to meet with you or with any member of your staff during these next weeks to anticipate and - so far as possible - answer questions and concerns in advance; I would of course also be glad to review any written materials you might send me.

c. Franklin Banks

Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

March 30, 1983

TO: Larry Johnson

FROM: Charles Glenn

RE: Review of Student Assignments

I expect to be reviewing Boston student assignments in late April, and HHH/ORC assignments in mid-May. Since the Order of Disengagement specifies that this review will be "prompt," I am attempting to identify potential issues in advance, and thereby to assure that data is supplied in a form which permits thorough review.

If you have any special concerns which we should be aware of, please send them along.

CG:ek

cc: Franklin Banks
Robert Blumenthal

Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

March 30, 1983

TO: Caroline Playter

FROM: Charles Glenn CG.

RE: Review of Student Assignments

I expect to be reviewing Boston student assignments in late April, and HHH/ORC assignments in mid-May. Since the Order of Disengagement specifies that this review will be "prompt," I am attempting to identify potential issues in advance, and thereby to assure that data is supplied in a form which permits thorough review.

If you have any special concerns which we should be aware of, please send them along.

CG:ek

cc: Franklin Banks
Robert Blumenthal

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

TO: Commissioner Lawson

FROM: Charles Glenn

DATE: April 28th 1983

RE: Boston Assignments: Extended Day Kindergarten

You will recall that we approved plans for an expansion of this program, with the stipulation that implementation of particular new sites or expansions would be contingent upon successful recruitment efforts. We now have the results of that recruitment, in the proposed assignments for Fall 1983. I want to call your attention to a few problem areas:

School	Black % Goal	Actual	White % Goal	Actual
Farragut	29%	11%	19%	37%
Garfield	29%	47%	19%	27%
Mendell	43%	27%	21%	33%
Parkman			21%	42%
Mozart	62%	27%	29%	68%
Grew			22%	35%
F Roosevelt			22%	37%
Marshall			14%	42%
Mason			37%	58%
Russell	37%	11%	37%	68%
Blackstone			15%	8%
Warren Prescott	40%	23%	15%	31%
Bradley			82%	100%
Guild	52%	40%	21%	60%

Please note:

(1) I have not assessed the "other minority" enrollments because the bilingual extended day programs assure a strong other minority participation overall.

(2) Overassignment of white students in some of the instances above represents a "margin of safety" and I expect that the eventual enrollments will be closer to the ideal: Mendell, Marshall, Mason. Farragut should be watched; though it is in "Roxbury" it is in the medical area and is probably drawing increasingly from the expensive new housing nearby, which is all to the good if it continues to serve minority students as well.

(3) Other schools (Parkman, Mozart, Grew, F Roosevelt, Russell, Warren Prescott, Bradley, Guild) are in white areas and should not be overassigning white students; I recommend that we call this to Mr. Coakley's attention.

(4) Several schools (P A Shaw, S Greenwood, Eliot, Hernandez) seem not to be getting their extended day programs off the ground through recruitment.

John H. Lawson, Commissioner of Education
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

February 23, 1983

Superintendent Robert Spillane
Boston Public Schools
26 Court Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Dear Dr. Spillane:

On January 26, 1983 John Coakley of your Department of Implementation provided Charles Glenn of my staff with documents detailing a proposed expansion of certain Extended Day Kindergarten programs and the creation of certain additional programs, as required under Judge Garrity's Order of December 23, 1982.

In response to a request for further information and justification of certain aspects of this proposal, Mr. Coakley provided such information in a letter dated February 18.

Our review of the original proposal and of the explanations and additional information indicates that the expansions and new programs are not inequitable, and they will achieve the desegregation objectives set by the Court to a substantial degree. We note the commitments made in the February 18 letter to limit enrollments in certain programs until successful recruitment efforts have taken place.

On the basis of this review, you have my approval to implement the program location, student assignment, and student transportation measures outlined for Dr. Glenn on January 26.

Sincerely yours,

John H. Lawson
Commissioner of Education

JHL:ek

cc: Dr. Charles Glenn

Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

February 22nd 1983

TO: Commissioner

FROM: Charles Glenn cG.

RE: Extended Day Kindergarten

I have just received and reviewed a detailed reply from John Coakley to my inquiry about the EDK expansion.

I regard the explanations and supplemental data as entirely adequate. As expected, Mr. Coakley was able to report on additional recruitment efforts, and also provides assurances, in several instances, that future assignments will be such that compliance is achieved or maintained.

There are instances in which I might have made a different decision, but that would be "second-guessing" the School Department. There are no problems which seem to me to justify withholding approval.

With respect to process, I believe that we have made clear that we expect detailed back-up for the School Department's proposed assignments, and that we will raise the appropriate questions about equity and desegregation impact. Here, for the record, is the process followed; I have set up a file with all of the documents:

1983	
1/24	telephone Coakley to Glenn to set up appointment to discuss kindergarten
1/25	Glenn brief discussions with Blumenthal and Banks re above
1/26	Glenn and Banks meeting with Coakley in his office, provided various documents; discussion of proposed expansion
1/27	Glenn, Banks, Blumenthal discussions
1/28	Boston coordination meeting; brief discussion
---	Glenn telephone checks with Playter and Johnson about plaintiff potential issues; Glenn review of prior orders, development of EDK analysis; discussions with Blumenthal; memo & charts prepared
2/14	Commissioner briefed by Glenn, Banks, Bohn; memo prepared from Glenn to Coakley raising questions - delivered by hand
2/15	Coakley telephone discussion with Glenn about the information requested, etc.

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
John R. Coakley, Senior Officer

February 18, 1983

Dr. Charles Glenn
Massachusetts Department of Education
Bureau of Equal Education Opportunity
1385 Hancock Street
Quincy, MA 02169

Dear Charles,

I am responding to your February 14th memorandum on Extended Day Kindergartens.

The decision of the School Committee and School Administration to expand the Extended Day Kindergartens in mid-year was made in late November or early December of 1982. I found myself with two problems:

- the need to activate a mini-assignment process in the disjointed month of December and in interruption of of our development of the 1983-84 Space Matrix, and
- uncertainty about the impending Disengagement Order, its timing, contents and protocol.

I chose, therefore, to move ahead with the mini-application/assignment process to see if we really would receive applications to the new programs. By late January there was a degree of clarity from the Disengagement Order and our staff had the early results of the mini-application process. I wrote to appropriate officials in the School Department and promptly moved to advise you and Franklin Banks. At the time of our meeting on January 26th it appeared to me that you were going to treat the EDK issue as one of monitoring and not one of review/approval. My recollection is that such a sentiment was conveyed to me at the meeting and in a later phone conversation with Franklin Banks.

I do not offer the above narrative to take issue in any way with your invoking the review/approval provisions of Section III of the Court's December 23, 1982 Disengagement Order. I merely have recited my understanding of events to place in context the actions taken by the Department of Implementation in recent weeks. We have indeed moved to assign students to the expanded Extended Day Kindergartens and to provide transportation for such eligible students as part of the normally-revised transportation package required each year by our obligation to reverse AM and PM kindergarten schedules. (Our transportation network is so complex that the mid-year reversal of kindergarten sessions has modest or major transportation changes for many students other than kindergarteners. For example, even some of our Humphrey Center runs may be affected in a given year.) We were obliged, therefore, to issue assignment and transportation notices which at least would arrive in school offices before February 18th for use by principals and teachers on February 28th, after the school vacation. We also were obliged to furnish routes to the transportation carrier this week in order for that company to adhere to its collective bargaining obligations to submit routes to drivers for bidding. (In September 1980 such failure/delay by us and the carrier was used as a pretext for a strike which lasted sixteen school days.) We acted on this matter out of a need to avoid operational confusion in a school system which simply cannot afford further difficulties. We did not act in defiance of the Court Order and the mandates given to the Board of Education. I certainly can understand the time lag between our meeting of January 26th and receipt of your memorandum on the evening of February 14th. I would trust that you and your superiors would appreciate the time-pressures and judicial/administrative uncertainties which affected this office during the past months.

If the explanations which follow do not seem adequate please know that I am prepared to respond in greater detail or to negotiate a resolution. The point again is that we do not wish to be in violation of the letter or spirit of the Court Orders.

You expressed three major concerns in your February 14th memorandum, and I am offering you responses to each concern.

Concern #1

Before determining my response to your concern about the location of Extended Day Kindergarten Programs (EDK) in areas of the city, I re-read our 54-page Federal Court filing, dated August 2, 1977, of which I was primary author. I also studied the Court's related Memorandum and Order of August 12, 1977. It is important to note that at the time the Court expressed some skepticism about our predictions on extended day kindergartens and their desegregative potential but did state that our measures should be tried and "merit the support of all the parties and the entire community." The Court, therefore, approved our plan as "consistent with the court's previous orders and as an imaginative implementation of them." It is my view that in accepting the plan the Court endorsed our "sectoring" of the geocodes and our identification of program sites. Further, it did not reject our repeated contention that we had distributed equitably the transportation burdens imposed upon ethnic groups. We took pains to "pair" programs in most districts whereby one program was in a minority area and the other program was in a white area. When, on four occasions we had to close or move programs, in each case (Lincoln to Blackstone, Bowditch to Higginson, Bradford to Chittick, Lyman to Adams) the result was not harmful and usually beneficial to minority students. When we opened an Extended Day Kindergarten (with involvement and support of the Court Expert) as a desegregative device in the Guild School in East Boston, we shortly followed the expansion with the creation of an EDK in the Hale School in Roxbury.

Excluding the Mattahunt School's Bilingual Extended Day Kindergarten, there presently are seven EDKs in Black areas, ten in White areas, two in Hispanic areas and three in Mixed*areas. Thus, there are twelve programs in Minority areas and ten in White areas. There is consonance in program distribution in a school system whose present kindergarten enrollment is 38% Black, 40% White and 22% Other Minority. We do believe we have been faithful to the filing of August 1977, have treated the task equitably and, at least on this issue, made believers of the skeptics. In fact, we even can recall proudly the lead editorial of the Boston Globe of June 24, 1977 when it lauded the plan as "convincing in its efforts to strengthen the elective kindergarten program, to keep kindergarteners in the public school system and to increase minority participation in the program not only for the purpose of compliance, but for the long-range benefit of the children in Boston's school system as a whole." I might add that I do have in my possession data to support the contention that a higher percentage of EDK students continue into our first grades. Incidentally, you will find in the Appendix the DI's racial/ethnic designations for the areas around each school. A few designations may be arguable but many probably are not disputable.

Relative to the expanded programs and locations, I would point out that five of the programs (including the Mattahunt's) are in Black areas, seven are in White areas, one in an Asian area, two in Hispanic areas and one is in a Mixed area. Thus, nine expanded programs will be in minority areas and seven will be in white areas.

In summary, we will have a total of 12 EDK schools in Black areas, 17 in White areas, 1 in an Asian area, four in Hispanic areas and four in Mixed areas. Worded another way, 21 EDK programs will be in minority areas and 17 will be in white areas. The ratio is not inconsistent with the current kindergarten enrollment.

However, I believe there is more dramatic evidence of our effort to address equity. Please examine the ratio of EDK schools to other schools on the basis of racial/ethnic designations:

Designation of School Area	All Elementary Schools	Current and Expanded EDKs
Black	19	12*
White	48	17
Asian	1	1
Hispanic	4	4
Mixed	6	4
Total	78	38*

*Mattahunt School is counted only once

I do not claim that the above analyses cannot be countered. You have advised me in a recent phone conversation that you did not count schools -- you counted spaces. However, your analysis probably could be countered too. For example the largest EDK in the city -- 99 students -- is at the Mather School. The common perception might be that such a school is a white neighborhood school but in fact that school is a "walking" school for nearly half the Black children in its kindergarten.

---

*A Mixed area is one where no racial/ethnic group is a significant majority. In each case at hand, the group in plurality is Black or Hispanic.

Comparable comments could be made about other schools (Gardner, Parkman, Russell, Garfield) which now serve minority children who indeed are "walkers," to use the jargon of our department.

Whatever the sins of the past, this school system -- to borrow a wonderful phrase from one of our fine legal counsel -- is in or approximating constitutional grace. We have made a determined effort to address equity in our school closing plan of 1981 when, by anyone's count, the preponderance of school closings (18 of 27) were in white neighborhoods. An examination of our Advanced Work sites would show that eleven of twenty are in minority neighborhoods. In fact, when the Seaver and the Bigelow Schools were closed, we moved their Advanced Work Programs to the Ellis and Dever Schools.

It is a simple matter to identify individual schools and individual neighborhoods (e.g., West Roxbury, North End, Charlestown, South Boston) and ask why EDK programs are sited there, as you did in our phone conversation. It is not appropriate, however, to raise such questions out of context. Of course, I know you are not advocating that those neighborhoods whose kindergartoners were born after 1974 and 1975 were to be forever damned to eternal fires. We both agree that the issue is one of remedy and equity, not revenge. I would argue -- and would hope that you and your superiors would agree -- that the data and our actions suggest we are not committing the same sins of the 1960's and early 1970's, that we have been faithful to the remedy and, on matters of student assignments, have been very conscious of equity.

Let me return more specifically to your request for an explanation of the selection of sites. In addition to the linked issues of equity and access, three other rationales were employed in selecting sites for the new programs. First, in early December I had just provided the Superintendent of Schools an assessment of "school-closing" possibilities. The key point in the paper was that a significant number of schools ought to close by June 1984. That same point has been made ad nauseam to the Educational Planning Group chaired by Mrs. McKeigue and can be inferred in a paper, filed in Court a year ago, in defense of starting K to VIII schools. The "vulnerable" schools in this system are by this time as well known to me as is my own name. In selecting new EDK sites I avoided "vulnerable" schools which, incidentally, often are ones in white neighborhoods of reduced public school enrollment. Secondly, in December we had no desire to cause overcrowding in schools of the city or to "bump" children out of schools. Therefore, staff members were asked to identify schools which -- according to our Space Matrix and the current student enrollments -- appeared to have unarguable available space. This criterion somewhat limited the choice of sites. Thirdly, I endeavored to identify at least one new program in each of the nine districts as well as to add two Spanish Bilingual EDKs and to introduce a Chinese Bilingual EDK and Cape Verdean Bilingal EDK. Incidentally, the number of sites had not been determined by me but by Deputy Supt. Rosen who had been a prime force in the School Committee's efforts to obtain supplementary educational funds from the City Council and Mayor.

The criteria or process used to identify sites have been offered in simple form. However, I am prepared, on a district-by-district basis, to defend or explain the logic of the site selections. A detailed knowledge of school locations, existing programs and available classrooms in each district make some of the selections plausible, if not obvious. For example, District I has seven elementary schools, five of which are in the Brighton/Allston sectors, and District III has nine elementary schools, only two of which are in minority areas. In effect, it is possible for us to file with you and your superiors a more detailed rationale, comparable in detail and approach to the Breeden/Coakley rationale for school closings in the 1980-81 school year.

Concerns #2 and #3

Even as your February 14th memorandum arrived, I was in receipt of our February 14th printout reflective of the recruitment effort described in my January 25th letter. As a result of your memorandum and my study of the February 14th memorandum I caused yet another printout (differing by a net of eight students) to be developed. That printout, dated February 16th, is being furnished to you with this report and is the basis for the following assessment.

Please bear in mind these cautions as you consider my assessment:

1. We are making assignments in the midst of a "live" period in the school year. A printout on February 16th can appear minutely different from one on February 17th as can one printed on February 18th. In other words, children drop out of the system each day or move within the city and request transfers each day. Be assured that such changes are the only ones which alter (or will alter) the assessment offered to you.
2. Your concern #2 deals with "expansions" and your concern #3 deals with "existing"programs. I feel it is proper to distinguish between existing programs and expanded programs. By and large, there is little we can do to adhere rigidly to enrollments and percentages in programs which were first determined last June 6th for 1982-83. Of course, we try to make assignments into such programs in a beneficial manner but we are somewhat at the mercy of reality when students "move" out of such programs.
3. This particular assessment focuses on non-bilingual EDKs. Please note that the following schools had or will have both bilingual and non-bilingual EDKs: Lee, Mattahunt, Blackstone McKay.

Existing Extended Day Kindergartens

Bearing in mind the above caution #2, I offer the following assessment of non-bilingual EDKs which have been in existence all year. I arrived at the assessment by comparing the Race-by-Grade Printout of February 10, 1983 with the attached EDK printout (erroneously labeled, by the way) of February 16, 1983. (In the case of non-bilingual programs at the Lee, Blackstone and McKay Schools I also referenced what we call a weekly "Budget Printout" which separates bilingual EDK from non-bilingual EDK.)

Farragut School - No change
Gardner School - In compliance
Higginson School - Improved slightly (9% White to 13% White)
Parkman School - No change
Lee School* - Improved (in the sense that it went from 4% to 13% Other Minority)
Mozart School - Slight decline
Chittick School - No change
F. Roosevelt School - No change
Fifield - Added 1 Black and 2 Whites in a school which is difficult to attain White percentages

Mather - In compliance
Mason - In compliance
Russell - In compliance
Blackstone* - Slight decline
Adams - In compliance
Guild - No significant change
Hale - No significant change (but beneficial to K-5 in a District IX School)
Hennigan - No significant change (but beneficial to K-5 in a District IX School)
McKay* - No change

*Assessment made on non-bilingual program only.

Expanded Extended Day Kindergartens

This assessment, I believe, shows you the improvement we have achieved since January 25th. It offers justifications for the minor statistical variances in schools such as those in District III and IV. (This hearkens to prolonged Court Hearings, filings and past communications among Messrs. Breeden,Coakley and Glenn on the difficulties or limitations in the use of the racial percentages. The Court itself has acknowledged some of the limitations, just as it has conceded the fluidity of enrollments and percentages throughout a typical school year.) The assessment also offers reasons for our advocating a broad or long-range view of the value of starting with enrollments in certain schools even though those enrollments, at first glance, may not appear to be desirable.

Garfield School Assigned: 9-5-6 = 20
45% 25%-30%

This program has five vacancies. Presently, its enrollment is "high" Black and "low" Other. The next three assignments if any are made, will be Other Minority students. It seems virtually certain that we can recruit one more Other Minority student, likely that we can recruit two, possible we can recruit three. We have a white waiting list which will not be activated, and we probably would have no trouble recruiting more Black students. However, our commitment is to assign three more Other Minority students before considering two more Black students.

Mendell School Assigned: 11-4-8=23
48%-17%-35%

No comment seems necessary

Mattahunt School Assigned: 13-4-2=19
68%-21%-11%

This program, exclusive of the existing Greek Bilingual Extended Day Kindergarten, has six vacancies. Presently, its enrollment is "low" White and "high" Other. However, due to the very low Other Minority enrollment in District III, the percentages above seem quite realistic. We do not expect to recruit more Other Minority students, will give first priority to new White students and would assign further Black students only on a paired basis. It is unlikely that this program in this school year will reach its capacity.

Kilmer School Assigned: 16-8-1 = 25
64%-32%-4%

No comment seems necessary

Grew School Assigned: 12-5-5 = 22
55%-23%=22%

We consider this program to be in compliance. The"low"Other Minority enrollment in District IV causes statistical distortions which are obvious. It surprised us to receive five Other Minority applications.

Dickerman School Assigned: 16-3-4 = 23
70%-13%-17%

You will recall that in January we weren't certain that this program could open. The enrollment is a tribute to outreach efforts of the school and of Assignment Specialist Jeannette Sisco of the Student Services Unit of the Department of Implementation. In a sense, Ms. Sisco has been our kindergarten specialist since the inception of the Department of Implementation. Her history of outreach is the reason we are able to "speak" with some certitude about enrollment potential (or lack of same) in this program. Please note that the above enrollment is 23. The printout erroneously has 1 student at the Everett; that student "is" a Dickerman EDP student.

Marshall School Assigned: 20-4-2 = 26
77%-15%-8%

This program is "low" Other Minority. However, its combination of Black and Other Minority enrollments is slightly above the ideal, and its White enrollment is slightly below the ideal. We would consider this program to be in compliance, particularly in view of the school's difficulty in maintaining its White enrollment.

Perkins School Assigned: 6-6-0 = 12
50%-50%-0%

District VI has a significant Other Minority enrollment but this new program is in competition with the established enrollments of the Dever, Mason and Russell Schools. Understandably, we had a comfortable number of White applicants. What we are trying to do is to take advantage of the willingness of some Black children to attend the Perkins School, a school which is in the heart of a housing project and which has not enrolled an adequate number of Black children at the grade 1 to grade 5 level. In summary, we consider this an affirmative assignment approach in a school which we will expect to retain for the indefinite future. We will not allow the White enrollment in the program to exceed the combined Black and Other Minority enrollment.

Eliot School Assigned: 12-5-0 = 17
71%-29%-0%

We have succeeded in recruiting white students, most of whom do not live in the North End, to this program. As yet, we have not recruited Other Minority students but are confident we can. The Eliot School has no kindergarten at all. It is a school which we think should be retained for its long-term potential in an area experiencing residential revitalization. The principal, Marion J. Fahey, will continue to seek Other Minority students, particularly from the Villa Victoria's extension which is nearly ready for occupancy.
We justify the location of this program as a logical effort to expand our system's enrollment in a school area which more and more is being viewed as attractive to persons of differing racial, cultural and economic groups.

Warren-Prescott School Assigned: 7-3-2 = 12
58%-25%-17%

This program is undersubscribed. The next three assignments to the school will be Other Minority. We will not activate any Black or White assignments until three Other Minority students are recruited. The principal, Marilyn Kiely, is experienced in attracting students to a school. She is the one responsible for advocating and articulating the transition of the Hale School to a successful citywide magnet school. It seems beneficial to the vitality of District VII's total (i.e.,K-12) enrollment to give encouragement to the strengthening of one of the two elementary schools in Charlestown.

Bradley School Assigned: 3-20-0 = 23
13%-87%-0%

On short notice, there was no problem in reaching the goal of 20 students from District VIII for the Bradley School. We had recruited two Black students and, even as I was writing this, received an acceptance from another Black student who is understandably not listed on the attached printout. We are confident that we can recruit two more Black or Other Minority students to the program. The white enrollment will not exceed 20. Please note that we never have had difficulty in attaining a 20% or better minority enrollment at the Adams Extended Day Kindergarten.

Hernandez School Assigned: 12-4-8 = 24
50%-17%-33%

We consider this program in compliance. The District IX percentage guidelines do not need to be followed rigidly in this school which is allowed to have an Hispanic enrollment up to 65%.

I have not mastered the technique of writing short letters or memoranda. Moreover, I just can't seem to end my communiques as tersely as you. Somehow, I need to conclude on some inconsequential note --- and I think I just have.

Sincerely,

John R. Coakley

Senior Officer

ab
Enclosures

xc: Franklin Banks
Catherine Ellison

PS - Forgive the gap on page 5. I wrote my responses in segments -- and in haste.

1/17/83

APPENDIX

Racial/Ethnic Designation of Elementary School Areas

Staff of the Department of Implementation sought to identify the racial/ethnic nature of the area (i.e., 6 to 12 geocodes) adjacent to each elementary school. Each designation was made (a) on the basis of a commonly-perceived picture of the area,(b) an examination of racial/ethnic geocode-loadings based on public school residents in 1982 and (c) an examination of the same geocode-loadings based on all school-age residents in 1982. The designations employed by staff were: Black - White - Asian - Hispanic - Mixed.

District	School	Current EDK	Expanded EDK	Designation
I	Baldwin			White/Asian
	Farragut	x		Mixed/Black
	Gardner	x		White/Asian
	Garfield		x	White
	Hamilton			White
	Tobin	x		Hispanic/Black
	Winship			White
II	Agassiz	x		White
	Ellis			Black
	Fuller			Mixed
	Higginson	x		Black
	J. Kennedy		x	Hispanic/Mixed
	Longfellow			White
	Manning			White
	Mendell		x	Hispanic/Mixed
	Parkman	x		White
III	Bates			White/Mixed
	Beethoven			White
	Kilmer		x	White
	Lee	x		Black
	Lyndon			White
	Mattahunt	x	x	Black
	Mozart	x		White
	Philbrick			White
	Sumner			White
IV	Channing			White
	Chittick	x		Black
	Conley			White
	E. Greenwood			White/Black
	Grew		x	White
	Hemenway			White
	F. Roosevelt	x		White
	P. Shaw	x		Black
	Taylor			Black/Mixed

1/17/83

District	School	Current EDK	Expanded EDK	Designation
V	Dickerman		x	Black
	Endicott			Black
	Everett			White/Mixed
	Fifield	x		Black/Mixed
	S. Greenwood		x	Black
	Holland			Black
	Kenney			White
	Marshall		x	Black/Mixed
	Mather	x		White/Mixed
	Murphy			White
	O'Hearn			White/Mixed
	Stone			Black
VI	Clap			White
	Condon			White
	Dever	x		Black
	Emerson		x	Mixed
	Mason	x		Mixed
	Perkins		x	White
	Perry			White
	Russell	x		White/Mixed
	Tynan			White
	Winthrop			Mixed
VII	Blackstone	x		Hispanic/Black
	Eliot		x	White
	Harvard-Kent			White
	Hurley			Black/Mixed
	Quincy		x	Asian
	Warren-Prescott		x	White
VIII	Adams	x		White
	Alighieri			White
	Bradley		x	White
	P. Kennedy			White
	O'Donnell			White
	Otis			White
IX	J. Curley			White/Mixed
	Guild	x		White
	Hale	x		Black
	Haley			White/Mixed
	Hennigan	x		Mixed
	Hernandez		x	Black
	Jackson-Mann			White/Asian
	McKay	x		White
	Ohrenberger			White
	Trotter			Black

Norw: Although some schools have two racial ethnic designation, only the first of such designations was used to arrive at the various tallies in the accompanying letter.

Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

February 14th 1983

TO: John Coakley

FROM: Charles Glenn C.

RE: Expansion of Extended Day Kindergarten

I have analyzed the proposed expansion of the extended day kindergarten program, as outlined in your letter of January 25th and discussed with you on January 26th; I have also discussed my analysis with Commissioner Lawson, Franklin Banks, and legal counsel. The Commissioner has directed me to raise with you certain concerns which require resolution before he could approve this expansion under the provisions of Section III of the Court's Disengagement Order of December 23rd 1982.

These are our concerns:

(1) The majority of the spaces which would be made available in new programs would be located in schools in predominantly white areas, although only 29% of the present EDK enrollment is white. This seems inconsistent with the present distribution of programs. Would you please explain the selection of sites for new programs?

(2) In five instances you had not (as of January 26th) assigned a sufficient number of minority students to schools in predominantly white areas to achieve the permitted enrollment range.

	Assigned 1/26/83	Permitted Range
Garfield	42% white	16-26% white
Grew	33% white	18-30% white
Perkins	69% white	29-49% white
Warren-Prescott	44% white	12-20% white
Bradley	100% white	up to 80% white

Have you acceptances from a sufficient number of minority parents in each case to assure that the EDK program would be within the permitted range?

(3) Program expansions in some cases involve similar problems. In two instances there is an under-assignment of white students to schools in predominantly minority areas (Blackstone, Higginson), and in three cases under-assignment of minority students to schools in predominantly white areas (Guild, Parkman, F. D. Roosevelt). Have you acceptances from a sufficient number of parents in each case to assure that the EDK program would be within the permitted range?

Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

February 4th 1983

REVIEW OF EXTENDED DAY KINDERGARTEN PROPOSALS

Equity

White students are over-represented in Boston's kindergartens, since many go on to parochial schools; for this reason, the standard for city-wide (magnet) district kindergarten enrollment is tied to the city-wide grade 1-5 enrollments, which are 25.1% white in January 1983. Overall Boston enrollment is 29.9% white.

An equitable distribution of extended day kindergarten places, then, would locate between 25% and 30% in schools located in white neighborhoods, and the balance in schools located in minority neighborhoods.

Current (January 1983) extended day kindergarten enrollment is 29.4% white but 48% are located in predominantly white neighborhoods.

Proposed expansion of existing programs doubles EDK enrollment, from 1,005 to 2,076. Expansion would occur evenly as between schools in predominantly white and schools in predominantly minority neighborhoods.

Proposed new EDK programs would add another 354 students, weighted 53.7% to schools in predominantly white neighborhoods.

By comparison (a) with present EDK enrollment and (b) with the city-wide standard cited above, the location of EDK programs is not equitable at present, and would not become equitable through the proposed expansion and creation of new programs.

[Contrasting location with present EDK enrollment, the present and expanded locations, in the aggregate, are 60% "whiter" than the enrollment, and the new locations, in the aggregate, are 80% "whiter" than the present enrollment.]

Is this a problem? If so, it is not a new problem; that is, the present pattern was approved previously by the Court. For example, the space matrix approved for 1979-80 places 52% of the EDK places in schools in predominatly white neighbrohoods.

Location of the new programs is striking; they include the first program in South Boston, the first in Charlestown, the first in West Roxbury, the first in Brighton, the first in the North End, and the first in Orient Heights. This suggests that the Court was not approving EDK programs in these distinctively white areas.

Desegregation

The desegregation objective for extended day kindergarten is stated in the March 24th 1982 Order:

> "Extended Day Kindergartens shall reflect the percentages of black, white and other minority students in grades 1 to 5 of the separate districts. However, the Extended Day Kindergarten of District VIII shall continue to have an enrollment which is 20% black and other minority."

Proposed Expansions

In several cases the projected enrollment (in each case but the McKay based upon actual assignments) does not fall within the allowed range for white students in the district in question.

Several instances involve over-assignment of white students to schools in minority neighborhoods:

Farragut
Fifield
Hale
Hennigan

One instance involves over-assignment of minority students to a school in a white neighborhood:

McKay

Such over-assignment seems appropriate in view of the possibility that not all of these students will actually attend.

Several instances involve under-assignment of white students to schools in minority neighborhoods:

Blackstone
Higginson

Other instances involve under-assignment of minority students to schools in white neighborhoods:

Parkman
F.D. Roosevelt
Guild

Such under-assignment seems inappropriate in view of the possibility that ever fewer students will actually attend. For the Roosevelt School in Hyde Park to have a projected 40% white enrollment (maximum permitted 30%) and the Guild School in East Boston to have a projected 43% white enrollment (maximum permitted 28%) is a significant deviation from the Court's desegregation objectives, especially in view of the possibility that actual enrollment will be even further out of line. Note that the present programs are each 42% white and thus already out of compliance.

Recommendation: approve expansion, but with stipulation that all further assignments to these programs between now and October 1st 1983 be limited to those which will help to bring the programs within the permitted enrollment range.

New Programs

As noted above, a number of proposed new programs would be located in schools in predominantly white neighborhoods, in which the Court has not previously approved extended day kindergartens. In most cases some or most of the potential students have already been assigned to these programs, with additional students yet to be invited. It is important to distinguish between the assigned and the intended enrollment of these new programs.

The intended enrollments are in most instances within the permitted range; the exceptions are the proposed over-assignment of which students to two programs in schools in minority neighborhoods:

Mattahunt Marshall

Such over-assignment is appropriate in view of the possibility that not all assigned students will actually intend.

. A matter of greater concern is the actual over-assignment of white students to several proposed programs in white neighborhoods:

School	Assigned 1/83	Permitted Range
Garfield (Brighton)	42% white	16-26% white
Grew (Hyde Park)	33% white	18-30% white
Perkins (South Boston)	69% white	29-49% white
Warren-Prescott (Charlestown)	44% white	12-20% white
Bradley (East Boston)	100% white	up to 80% white

The danger in these cases is that new programs will be established which will not draw the necessary number of minority kindergarten students to a school in a white neighborhood. Note the present kindergarten enrollment of these schools:

Garfield	97% white
Grew	85% white
Perkins	98% white (1 American-Indian)
Warren-Prescott	97% white
Bradley	90% white

Review of 2/82 data on enrollment-by-geocode confirms that present kindergarten enrollment reflects residential patterns near these schools.

Recommendation: implementation of these new extended day kindergartens should not be permitted until parent acceptances have been received which indicate that each program will be within the required ranges:

Garfield	Warren-Prescott
Grew	Bradley
Perkins	

Bilingual

Overall the bilingual extended day programs would be expanded at nearly the same rate as the non-bilingual programs, and the locations create no special difficulties. There are a few issues, however.

(1) A very small Spanish program (5 students) would be started at the Sarah Greenwood. This school does not have a bilingual kindergarten at present, though it does have 82 students in bilingual classes. Why not create a larger-and more cost-effective bilingual EDK?

(2) A very small Cape Verdean EDK program (4 students) would be started at the Emerson School, which has 56 students in its bilingual program. Why not create a larger EDK program?

(3) The Greek EDK program at the Mattahunt School would be doubled from 17 to 34 students. The Greek bilingual program in this school enrolls 91 students (half of the 182 white students attending the school), and 34 seems a disproportionately large kindergarten, even assuming that all Greek bilingual kindergarten students enroll in extended day.

(4) This raises the question of equitable distribution of EDK for bilingual students.

Language Group	Enrollment	Proposed EDK	Proportion
Cape Verdean	409	4	1%
Chinese	854	25	3%
French (Haitian)	401	38	9%
Greek	180	34	19%
Italian	414	12	3%
Portuguese	82	-	-
Spanish	3,935	296	8%

Recommendation: The only desegregation implication is the possible over-enrollment of Greek students in bilingual programs as a way of avoiding desegregated classrooms. While such allegations have been heard from time to time about both Greek and Italian programs, we have no direct evidence and there is no ground for holding up approval of the EDK expansion and new program sites. The Bureau of TBE should raise programmatic questions about the small programs at the Greenwood and the Emerson, and we should remain open to an expansion of these programs.

BOSTON EXTENDED DAY KINDERGARTENS

per EEO 2/83

		Approved for 79-80		Approved for 82-83		Actual 1/83	Expansion	
I	Farragut	3	60	2	50	27	27	
	Gardner	4	100	2	50	46	54	
	Tobin (TBE)	4	80	1	25	23	25	Spanish
	Garfield		—		—	—	29	
	*Sub Total		240		125	96	135	
II	Bowditch	4	100					
	Mendell						19	
	Mendell (TBE)	4	80					
	Parkman	4	100	2	50	53	54	
	Agassiz (TBE)			1	25	24	25	Spanish
	Higginson			2	50	45	49	
	Kennedy (TBE)		—		—	—	25	Spanish
	*Sub Total		280		125	122	172	

		79-80		82-83		1/83	Expansion	
III	Lee	4	100	2	50	47	53	
	Lee (TBE)			1	25	25	27	Spanish
	Mattahunt						19	
	Mattahunt (TBE)			1	25	17	17	Greek
	Mozart	4	100	2	50	51	50	
	Kilmer		—		—	—	26	
	*Sub Total		200		150	140	192	
IV	Chittick			2	50	50	50	
	F Roosevelt	4	100	2	50	50	50	
	PA Shaw (TBE)			1	25	19	19	Italian
	Grew						26	
	Bradford	4	100		—	—	—	
	*Sub Total		200		125	119	145	
V	FiField	4	100	2	50	49	52	
	Mather	8	200	4	100	89	106	
	Dickerman						25	
	S. Greenw.(TBE)						5	Spanish
	Marshall						16	
	* Sub Total		300		150	138	204	

		79-80		82-83		1/83	Expansion	
VI	Mason	4	100	2	50	49	50	
	Rusell	4	100	2	50	46	51	
	Dever (TBE)			1	25	18	23	Spanish
	Emerson (TBE)						4	Cape Verdean
	Perkins						25	
	* Sub Total		200		125	113	153	
VII	Prince	4	100					
	Blackstone			2	50	56	61	
	Blackstone(TBE)			1	25	25	25	Spanish
	Eliot						32	
	Quincy (TBE)						25	Chinese
	Warren-Presc						31	
	* Sub Total		100		75	81	174	
VIII	Lyman	4	100					
	Adams			2	50	44	52	
	Bradley						28	
	* Sub Total		100		50	44	80	
IX	Guild	4	100	1	25	31	30	
	Hale	4	100	1	25	21	21	
	Hennigan	5	100	2	50	51	48	
	McKay	4	100	2	50	43	45	
	McKay (TBE)			1	25	6	6	Italian
	Hernandez (TBE)						26	Spanish
	* Sub Total		400		175	152	170	
	TOTALS:		2,020		1,100	1,005	1,425	

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
John R. Coakley, Senior Officer

January 24, 1983

MEMORANDUM

To: Rosemarie Rosen
Oliver Lancaster
Robert Peterkin

From: John Coakley John Coakley

Subject: Progress Report on Expansion of Extended Day Kindergarten

We have sent out two News Releases on Extended Day Kindergarten to the media in the last month as well as notices and brochures to agencies and our schools. We observed the news releases in numerous weekly papers, but received little coverage from the daily papers or non-print media. Consequently, we have received very few new applications to kindergarten in recent weeks. However, we did receive approximately 925 applications for Extended Day Kindergarten from our own kindergarteners. The number is rather significant when you realize that 1600 of our current 4400 kindergarteners already are in Extended Day Kindergartens or are in unique Special Education classes or are in popular District IX schools (and probably do not wish to jeopardize their upcoming first grade assignments).

You will recall that we identified 16 potential new sites with a total of 400 potential spaces. In addition, we had some vacancies in existing Extended Day Kingergartens and we "advertised" those vacancies as well as the new sites. Within a week or so we will assign 294 of the 925 applicants to available spaces in the Extended Day Kindergarten. At the same time we will be offering alternate assignments to about 75 other children. (For example, a child may have expressed an interest in the Farragut EDP, but could not be obliged by us; we now may offer him/her an assignment to the Garfield EDP.)

The casual observer may not be pleased with the results of the assignment efforts, but I feel very encouraged about this mid-year endeavor. Allow me to point out these facts:

1. We are somewhat inhibited by having to adhere to racial/ethnic guidelines. In some cases programs are over-subscribed but underassigned.

2. The "old" Extended Day Kindergartens with regular education children will be at capacity in 15 schools and very near capacity in 3 schools.

3. The "old" Extended Day Kindergartens with bilingual children will be at capacity in 5 schools, and below capacity in 3 schools serving Italian, Greek and Haitian children.

4. The "new" Extended Day Kindergartens with regular education children should -- in my opinion -- open at about 75% of capacity.

5. The "new" Extended Day Kindergartens with bilingual children will be at capacity in two schools, well below capacity in one school (with a Cape Verdean bilingual EDK) and possibly below capacity in another school.

My colleagues and I believe the new EDKs could reach 80% of capacity by April. We think that is remarkable given the relative suddenness of the mid-year recruiting.

I should point out, however, that the expansion is not without its problems:

a) It always is difficult for parents and school persons to accept the fact that we must assign on the basis of racial/ethnic percentages, and that sometimes we must under-assign despite the numbers of applications.

b) Where necessary, we assigned on a random basis. Predictably, such assignments cause family or neighborhood problems or inconveniences. We will be able to address favorably very few of the complaints.

c) Two new "programs" at the Dickerman and Eliot Schools are dependent on our current second-round invitations. (See paragraph #2). Those two schools will not have Extended Day Kindergartens unless we can create desegregated enrollments. We will confer with the two principals this week to enlist their efforts at outreach.

d) At least two existing Half-Day programs have lost so many children to Extended Day Kindergartens as to be embarrassingly under-enrolled: Hernandez and Bradley. There may be other schools with less dramatic enrollment problems.

e) We are working now on transportation for the new programs, and are assuming that others are addressing such matters as staffing, training, materials and furniture.

In conclusion, we will be contacting a very small number of parents this week (i.e., before January 29th) to offer alternative EDK assignments, We will seek to notify at least 294 (and possibly 50 to 60 more) students (and the schools) of the new EDK assignments on or shortly after February 3rd. We will notify all kindergarteners (and the schools) of the "second-semester" transportation assignments between February 14th and 18th. The new EDKs should commence on February 28th, the same day on which AM and PM half day sessions are reversed.

I hope that this overview is of some value. I will be seeking this week to advise appropriate monitors of the State Board of our EDK expansion and of our continuing compliance with the appropriate Court Order of August 12, 1977. Needless to say, feel free to call.

JC:ab

xc: Robert Spillane
Community Superintendents
Catherine Ellison

bc. J. [illegible]
Lydia
Arthur, Barb
[illegible]
Jeannette [illegible]

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
John F. Coakley, Senior Officer

January 25, 1983

Mr. Charles Glenn
Equal Education Opportunities
State Department of Education
1585 Hancock Street
Quincy, MA 02169

Dear Charlie,

I look forward to meeting with you on Wednesday, January 26th at 10:30 a.m. to discuss our expansion of the Extended Day Kindergarten. As you know, in the summer of 1977 we agreed to provide Extended Day Kindergartens as desegregative alternatives to the neighborhood half-day kindergartens. Most of us believe the EDKs have served us well from both educational and desegregative points of view.

The enclosed material may be of assistance to you. Possibly Frank might wish to attend the meeting which might well constitute the first monitoring session. It is possible that I will ask Dr. Ellison and other staff also to be in attendance.

Sincerely,

John Coakley

Senior Officer

ab
Enclosure

xc: Franklin Banks
Catherine Ellison
John Canty
Lydia Francis

	Present EDKs (1/20/83)				Expansion: Assigned			
	B	W	O	T	B	W	O	T
rragut	7	10	10	27	7	10	10	27
ardner	18	10	18	46	18	12	24	54
rfield	-	-	-	-	4*	5	3*	12
obin (S)	0	1	22	23	-	-	25	25
gassiz (S)	0	0	24	24	-	-	25	25
igginson	26	4	15	45	26	6	17	49
FK (S)	-	-	-	-		2	23	25
endell	-	-	-	-	9	3*	6	18
arkman	25	17	11	53	26	17	11	54
ilmer	-	-	-	-	12*	8	1	21
ee (S)	0	0	25	25	-	-	27	27
ee	30	16	1	47	30	16	7	53
attahunt (G)	0	17	0	17	-	17	-	17
attahunt	-	-	-	-	8	3	2	13
ozart	26	18	7	51	25	19	6	50
hittick	34	12	4	50	34	12	4	50
rew	-	-	-	-	9*	6	3*	18
DR	29	21	0	50	30	20	0	50
. Shaw (H)	19	0	0	19	19	-	-	19
ickerman	-	-	-	-		*		
ifield	33	14	2	49	34	16	2	52
. Greenwood(S)	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	5
arshall	-	-	-	-	10	4	2	16
ather	55	20	14	89	69	20	17	106
ever (S)	1	0	17	18	1	-	22	23
merson (CV)	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	4
ason	18	22	9	49	21	18	11	50
erkins	-	-	-	-	4	9	0	13
ussell	13	20	13	46	15	22	14	51
lackstone (S)	0	0	25	25	-	-	25	25
lackstone	40	9	7	56	39	10	12	61
liot	-	-	-	-				
uincy (C)	-	-	-	-	1	-	24	25
arren-Prescott	-	-	-	-	4	4	1	9
dams	7	32	5	44	8	39	5	52
radley	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	20
uild	14	13	4	31	14	13	3	30
ale	10	9	2	21	10	9	2	21
ennigan	28	17	6	51	27	16	5	48
ernandez (S)	-	-	-	-	14	4	8	26
cKay (I)	0	6	0	6	-	6	-	6
cKay	30	8	5	43	30	8	5	43
TOTAL	463	295	247	1005	562	374	357	1293

* To Be Invited

	B	W	O	T
Garfield	9	-	8	17
Mendell	-	1	-	1
Kilmer	5	-	-	5
Mattahunt	**	4	-	4
Grew	7	-	1	8
Dickerman	***	9	***	9
Marshall	****	3	-	3
Perkins	6	-	6	12
Eliot	14	4	14	32
W. Prescott	8	-	14	22
Bradley	6	-	2	8
McKay	-	2	-	2

** May assign 2 Black if 2+ White accept

*** Could assign 12+ Black and 4 Other Minority dependent on White acceptances

**** Could assign up to 6 Black if some of 3 White accept

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Analysis of 1983 Boston Student Assignments: Magnet Elementary Schools

Boston operates ten magnet elementary schools under the 1975 Desegregation Order. Desegregation of these schools is achieved entirely by voluntary attendance by students whose parents make applications in the Spring of each year on a city-wide basis.

Eight of the schools are expected to achieve racial proportions which reflect system-wide enrollment in grades 1-5, except those students resident in District VIII (East Boston). Racial/ethnic percentage goals for 1983-84 were computed in early April 1983:

	Ideal	Permitted Range
Black	52%	49% - 55%
White	21%	16% - 26%
Other	27%	25% - 29%

Sources: May 10, 1975 Order; March 24, 1982 Order; April 12, 1983 memo from John Coakley to John Canty.

The McKay School in East Boston is required to reflect citywide percentages in grades 1-5, thus including East Boston:

	Ideal	Permitted Range
Black	47%	45% - 49%
White	28%	23% - 33%
Other	25%	24% - 26%

Sources: March 24, 1982 Order, with percentages calculated by me from the April 27, 1983 print-out of proposed assignments.

The Hernandez School in Dorchester is required to comply with the following provision of the May 10, 1975 Order, reaffirmed by the March 24, 1982 Order: "The Hernandez School, which contains a citywide Spanish-English bilingual program, may enroll a student body up to 65%

Hispanic. Non-Hispanic other minority students will be eligible along with white and black students, within the remaining 35% of school capacity" (page 75f.).

The chart which I have prepared applies the standard set for the eight schools to the other two as well, in order to consider the overall impact of magnet schools, but in my discussion I will take into account the special criteria set for the McKay and Hernandez.

Further language in a March 10, 1982 School Department proposal approved by the Court in the March 24, 1982 Order should be noted:

> Exceptions to the variation limits . . . shall continue to be permitted where necessary to allow appropriate bilingual and/or substantially separate special needs assignments.

Several magnet elementary schools are heavily impacted by bilingual and/or substantially separate special needs assignments:

School	1983-84 Bilingual	1983-84 Sub. Separate
Curley	0	0
Guild	0	0
Hale	0	0
Haley	0	0
Hennigan	182 (Spanish)	0
Hernandez	124 (Spanish)	0
Jackson/Mann	138 (Vietnamese)	31*
McKay	73 (Italian)	0
Ohrenberger	47 (Lao/Khmer)	23
Trotter	0	17

* does not include 133 substantially-separate students in the Horace Mann section of the facility

The projected enrollments of magnet elementary schools will be analysed in two ways: to determine how closely each school meets the desegregation goals in the three racial/ethnic categories, and to assess the relation between Black and white enrollment. The second analysis will permit us to set "other minority" enrollment aside and thus to avoid the distorting effect of bilingual programs (except the Italian program) upon racial proportions. The ratio between "ideal Black percentage" and "ideal white percentage" for 1983-84 is 2.48/1, and the white and Black proportions of each school will be assessed for proximity to that ratio.

These are the questions which I will be asking of the enrollment data and projections:

* Will each school be in compliance in the three racial/ethnic categories? If not, how serious are the instances of non-compliance? Are there program considerations which explain it, such as a bilingual program?

* To what extent do Fall 1983 assignments to the first grade correct past problems, as measured by racial/ethnic proportions in first grades in April 1983, and by overall racial/ethnic proportions in grades 1-5? Do the new assignments to the first grade (I have no way of assessing assignments to upper grades) in any case exacerbate desegregation problems? For the purpose of this analysis please note that the permitted ranges for 1982-83 were as follows:

	Ideal	Permitted Range
Black	52%	49% - 52%
White	23%	18% - 28%
Other	25%	23% - 27%

The ratio of "ideal Black percentage" to "ideal white percentage" was 2.26/1.

* Do overall magnet elementary school enrollments meet the intentions of the desegregation orders, including equitable representation of the three racial/ethnic categories? For example, is the permitted over-enrollment of Hispanic students at the Hernandez balanced elsewhere?

PROJECTED COMPLIANCE

Curley

This school is within the permitted range for Black and white students, but below the range for other minority students, though located next to a middle school which is 40% other minority, and near the heavily Hispanic Hyde Square section of Jamaica Plain. More precisely, projected Black enrollment is 1% above the "ideal", and projected white enrollment 13% above, while projected other minority enrollment is 13% below the "ideal". Setting other minority students aside, the ratio of Black to white students is projected to be 2.22/1, fairly close to the "ideal" ratio of 2.48/1; white students are slightly "over-assigned".

Guild

This school is high in Black and white enrollment and low in other minority enrollment; Black enrollment is 12% above the ideal, and white enrollment a substantial 48% above (31% projected, 21% ideal). Other minority enrollment is 60% below the ideal (11% projected, 27% ideal). The ratio of Black to white students is lower than in most magnet elementary schools: 1.87/1 compared to the ideal ratio of 2.48/1. Presumably the school's location in East Boston has something to do with this disproportion.

Hale

This school, by contrast, is located in Roxbury, but it "under-enrolls" Black students by comparison with white nearly as severely: 1.90/1. Black projected enrollment is in fact within the permitted range, with white enrollment 28% above the ideal (27% projected, 21% ideal). Other minority enrollment is low by 19% (22% projected, 27% ideal). Over-assignment of white students to this school, in view of its location, is more sensible than over-assignment of white students to the Guild; it may be regarded as a prudent margin; we will see, in fact, that there is a corrective action involved.

Haley

The Haley, located in Roslindale, has consistently been a successfully desegregated school, and the ratio of Black to white students projected is a nearly-ideal 2.38/1; no other magnet elementary school comes as close to the ideal 2.48/1. Black projected enrollment is slightly high (8% above the ideal), white projected enrollment within the range, and other minority projected enrollment low by 24% (projected 20%, ideal 27%).

Hennigan

With the Hennigan in Jamaica Plain we begin to see where the other minority magnet students have been assigned! The school is 58% high in this category (43% projected, 27% ideal), with Black students 26% low and white students 15% low (though within the permitted range). The ratio of Black to white is a quite favorable 2.14/1, however, and the enrollment problems are attributable largely to the large Spanish bilingual program.

Hernandez

The Hernandez is projected to be slightly above its permitted other minority proportion (68% versus 65%) as a result, largely, of the Spanish bilingual program. It appears that 11 Hispanic students will attend the Hernandez who are not enrolled in the program, together with 26 white and 39 Black students (K-5), resulting in a non-bilingual enrollment which will be 51% Black, 34% white, and 14.5% other minority. The Black/white ratio is a low 1.75/1. The unusual assignment pattern of the Hernandez, though permitted by the Court, creates problems from the point of view of state bilingual program policy, which seeks to locate bilingual programs in large schools with a majority of non-limited-English-speaking students, to facilitate educational mainstreaming and maximum integration in non-instructional activities. The Hernandez is one of the smallest schools in Boston, with one of the largest elementary bilingual programs.

Jackson Mann

This school, located in Allston/Brighton, is projected to be high in other minority enrollment (34% above the ideal), with a large Vietnamese bilingual program accounting for this. White enrollment proportion is projected at almost the ideal, with Black enrollment 18% low at 42% of the total. As this suggests, the ratio between Black and white enrollment is a low 1.98/1.

McKay

The McKay, in East Boston, is subject to special provisions (outlined above) which raise the permitted range for white students and lower those for Black and other minority students; the presence of an Italian bilingual program also has the effect of pushing white enrollment up. It is interesting to observe, therefore, that the projected Black enrollment proportion is within the higher range which other magnet schools must observe, and is "too high" for the special provisions applying to the McKay. White projected enrollment, at 26%, is at the upper limit of the range applied to other magnet schools but slightly low by the "McKay standard", while other minority enrollment is low by either standard.

Ohrenberger

The Ohrenberger, like the Haley and the Trotter, began as a magnet school before the May 10, 1975 Order, and has consistently functioned well as a desegregated school. Black, white, and other minority enrollment are all projected to be very close to ideal, with the Black/white ratio closer to the ideal than any school except the Haley.

Trotter

Black projected enrollment is close to ideal, white at the upper end of the permitted range, and other minority slightly below the permitted range (23% projected, 27% ideal). Black/white ratio is low at 1.95/1.

CONTRIBUTION OF NEW ASSIGNMENTS

To assess the extent to which new assignments contribute to achieving the desegregation goals for each school I have compared (1) the proportion of each racial/ethnic category in the new first grade assignments to each school with (2) the present (April 1983) first grades, recognizing that students in attendance and students assigned cannot strictly be compared. I have also compared (3) the current grade 1-5 enrollment, by racial/ethnic category, of each school with (4) its projected grade 1-5 enrollment. I have then compared each of these twelve proportions (three racial/ethnic categories times four) with the appropriate "ideal", and stated the result as a percentage above or below "0.0". Finally, I have calculated the ratio of Black to white percentages in each school, and compared it with the ideal ratio (2.48/1 for 1983-84 and 2.26/1 for 1982-83).

Curley

The white proportion grades 1-5 at the Curley has been high (17% over the ideal), and the current first grade has had a corrective effect, with a lower proportion of white students. The newly-assigned first grade continues this effort to match the school with the "ideal" white proportion. The current first grade is too high in Black and too low in other minority enrollment, but the new assignments of both groups are right on target. The ratio of Black to white students is improved, both for first grade and for grades 1-5. In all respects, then, the new assignments to the Curley have an appropriate impact.

Guild

The current first grade has much too high a Black proportion (75%), and indeed only the fifth grade is within the permitted range; new first grade assignments will have a corrective effect, being slightly below the "ideal". The question is, whether the new assignments are overcorrecting. Only 12 Black students will be assigned, compared with 36 in the present first grade.

The white proportion, already at the upper limit of the permitted range, will become substantially above that limit (and 48% above the ideal) as a result of the decrease in Black assignees. Other minority proportion, already below the permitted range, will become even more out of compliance (going from 44% below the ideal, grades 1-5, to 60% below!). The Black/white ratio is swinging sharply, from 4.5/1 in the present first grade to 1.33/1 in the newly-assigned first grade. Close attention is needed to the racial makeup of this school.

Hale

New assignments of Black students to the Hale similarly correct an over-enrollment of Black students in the present first grade and in the school in general; again, the numbers drop sharply, from 32 to 11. Present white enrollment in the first grade is low, but the newly-assigned first grade is high in white proportion, despite a decline in the number of students, because of the sharp decline in Black assignees. The under-enrollment of other minority students is corrected by a projected first grade which is right on target. Black and other minority enrollment is projected closer to compliance, and white enrollment further above compliance, in 1983-4 compared with 1982-3; this is a school to which it may be particularly appropriate to over-assign white students in the expectation that not all will actually attend.

Haley

The present first grade is low Black and high white, and the new assignments have a somewhat corrective effect; the other minority proportion is low and getting lower, with the newly-assigned first grade exacerbating the effect.

Hennigan

This large school (with a large Spanish bilingual program) has been low in Black enrollment in each grade but the first, which was assigned an unusually high number of Black students in 1982 in common, as we will see, with other magnet elementary schools. The newly-assigned first grade swings sharply the other way, bringing the school-wide proportion Black down from 42% to 38%, with actual numbers of Black first graders dropping from 58 to 23. As with the Guild and the Hale, this drop in Black enrollment brings an increase in the proportion of white enrollment, causing a projected first grade only 3% below the ideal white proportion, contrasted with 41% below in the current first grade. The other minority grades 1-5 enrollment, already substantially above the permitted range, becomes even further above the ideal (58%) as a result of the decline in Black assignments to the first grade; note, however, that this is the result of the large Spanish bilingual program, and that non-bilingual other minority enrollment is below 15%.

Hernandez

Only two white students are assigned to the first grade of the Hernandez for next year, with a sharp swing in the Black/white ratio in that grade from 1.44/1 to 4/1. The other minority proportion in the first grade increases from 63% (slightly below the 65% limit) to 67%.

Jackson/Mann

"Over-assignment" of new white students brings this school very close to the ideal white percentage, while projected Black percentage improves very slightly but without coming within the permitted range. The new assignees are quite close to the ideal percentage other minority, and this (together with the change in the "ideal") moves the enrollment grades 1-5 from 56% above the ideal to 34% above. The Black/white ratio moves away from the ideal.

McKay

The new assignments are a general improvement for this school, with the proportion of Black and white students assigned closer to the ideal, and some progress in assignment of other minority students.

Ohrenberger

White and Black students are over-represented in the present first grade; the projected first grade will have fewer of both groups, and more other minority students. As a result, other minority enrollment in grades 1-5 will come within the permitted range, while Black and white enrollments remain within it. The Black/white ratio, already good, will improve slightly.

Trotter

More Black and fewer white students will be assigned to first grade, remaining within the permitted range (note that the graduating fifth grade is above that range in proportion Black), while the assignment of a smaller proportion of other minority students than last year leaves the school slightly below the compliance range in this racial/ethnic category. The Black/white ratio will not be as good as it has been this year.

Summary

It has been customary to state "compliance" in terms of the number of schools in or out of compliance in each of the three racial/ethnic categories. I hope that this detailed discussion demonstrates that each school is much more dynamic than such an analysis can hope to show, and that particularly the relation between bilingual program assignments and other minority enrollment requires other approaches to assessing compliance. For example, the over-representation of other minority students in certain schools (Hennigan, Hernandez, Jackson/Mann) to permit clustering of bilingual students for a full program requires under-assigning such students to other magnet elementary schools, unless they are to receive far more than their share of magnet school places. The reason that the Ohrenberger does better than the Haley or the Trotter in meeting the other minority standard is that it accommodates a small Lao/Khmer bilingual program. In short, only a clear view of the broad picture makes it possible to do justice to the enrollment efforts for individual schools. I believe the ratio between Black and white enrollment represents a helpful "short-hand" by which schools can be compared with one another.

Having stated that reservation, it is appropriate to express concern about the Guild school, whose Black and white enrollments are in serious disproportion, fluctuating from year to year in a way which may produce immediate results in overall "compliance" but possibly at the expense of stable, long-term desegregation.

The Hernandez is also cause for concern, for reasons stated above. It is fair to add that my personal observations several years ago suggested that the school was functioning well, as small schools often do, and with a distinctive Hispanic flavor which made it unusually attractive.

OVERALL MAGNET ELEMENTARY ENROLLMENT

The opinion is widespread, that magnet elementary schools in Boston (as in many other cities) cater especially to white students, and serve them to a disportionate extent. An analysis of mine a few years ago, in fact, found that one white student in three but one Black student in five grades k-12 attended a magnet school at that time. This has changed dramatically.

Considering grades 1-5, 17% of the Black students, 17% of the white students, and 18% of the other minority students at that grade level are attending magnet schools in 1982-83. Magnet schools are 47% Black at that level, compared with 49% for the system as a whole; magnet schools and the system were an identical 25% white, and magnet schools were 28% other minority in grades 1-5, compared with 22% for the system. (Numbers and percentages for grade levels 1-5, 6-8, and 9-12, and for a total which includes K and 13 are given in a chart following this report.)

In brief, magnet elementary schools are at least equally available to minority students as to white students in Boston.

This is confirmed by the bottom lines of the chart showing enrollments for each magnet elementary school. While Black students are "under-represented" by a substantial 9% compared with the "ideal" proportion (47% compared with 52%), in fact we have already seen that current Black enrollment in grades 1-5 is 49% of the total. The real under-representation is by a moderate 4%. Current first grades, in fact, are 52% Black.

Similarly, white students are "over-represented" in the current year by 8% (25% compared with 23% ideal), and the projected enrollments increase this to 13% (24% compared with 21% ideal), in fact the current white enrollment in grades 1-5 is 25% of the total. Magnet elementary schools - taken as a group - are remarkably close to the real city-wide white proportion.

Other minority proportions are shown as 11% high currently and 6% high in the projected enrollments, and we have already seen that in fact other minority students are slightly over-represented in magnet elementary schools.

What accounts for the disparity between the "ideal" Black and white proportions for magnet elementary schools and the actual city-wide Black and white proportions? Simply that District VIII, with its predominanly white population, is not included in determining the "ideal", even though many District VIII students attend magnet schools. Taking this into account, the ratio of Black students to white students in grades 1-5 city-wide is 1.96/1, very close to the 1.92/1 in the current magnet school grades 1-5, and to the projected 2.0/1 based upon assignments for September 1983.

The school-by-school analysis above has used the official "ideal" proportions because they represent the standard which the Boston Public Schools have proposed to meet (in their March 1982 filing, approved and ordered by the Court), but the widespread controversy over the future of magnet schools makes it advisable to show as well the true picture based upon system-wide enrollments.

CONCLUSIONS

The magnet elementary schools in Boston are equitable in terms of whom they serve, and successful from a desegregation perspective. Although it is not within the scope of this analysis, it may be important to add that these schools cannot be called "elitist" in the sense that some magnet elementary schools in other cities deliberately seek the most academically gifted students.

Bilingual program students are "over-represented" in magnet elementary schools, representing 15.2% of the total enrollment, compared with 11.2% in the system in general. Substantially-separate students represent 3.6% of the grade 1-5 magnet school enrollment compared with 4.8% for the system in general.

I see no reason why the 1983 magnet elementary school assignments should not be approved.

I recommend that the Department of Implementation be asked to develop an enrollment plan for the Guild School, to assure its long-term desegregation stability, and that the Bureau of Transitional Bilingual Education review the extent to which educational mainstreaming and integration is possible at the Hernandez School.

Charles L. Glenn, Director
May 5th 1983

①

	Black	Percent	Ideal	Devia.	White	Percent	Ideal
Curley	144	0.53	0.52	0.01	65	0.24	0.21
new 1	27	0.52	0.52	0.00	11	0.21	0.21
curr 1	33	0.58	0.52	0.11	13	0.23	0.23
curr 1-5		0.52	0.52	0.00		0.27	0.23
Guild	129	0.58	0.52	0.12	69	0.31	0.21
new 1	12	0.50	0.52	-0.04	9	0.38	0.21
curr 1	36	0.75	0.52	0.44	8	0.17	0.23
curr 1-5		0.60	0.52	0.16		0.26	0.23
Hale	99	0.51	0.52	-0.01	52	0.27	0.21
new 1	11	0.42	0.52	-0.19	8	0.31	0.21
curr 1	32	0.58	0.52	0.12	11	0.20	0.23
curr 1-5		0.56	0.52	0.08		0.26	0.23
Haley	145	0.56	0.52	0.08	61	0.24	0.21
new 1	30	0.58	0.52	0.11	12	0.23	0.21
curr 1	23	0.44	0.52	-0.15	16	0.31	0.23
curr 1-5		0.51	0.52	-0.01		0.28	0.23
Hennigan	199	0.38	0.52	-0.26	93	0.18	0.21
new 1	23	0.36	0.52	-0.31	13	0.20	0.21
curr 1	58	0.56	0.52	0.07	14	0.13	0.23
curr 1-5		0.42	0.52	-0.20		0.21	0.23
Hernandez	35	0.21	0.52	-0.60	20	0.12	0.21
new 1	8	0.27	0.52	-0.49	2	0.07	0.21
curr 1	13	0.22	0.52	-0.58	9	0.15	0.23
curr 1-5		0.23	0.52	-0.57		0.12	0.23

②

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	Black	Percent	Ideal	Devia.	White	Percent	Ideal
Jacks/M	254	0.42	0.52	-0.18	128	0.21	0.21
new 1	43	0.39	0.52	-0.24	34	0.31	0.21
curr 1			0.52				0.23
curr 1-5		0.42	0.52	-0.20		0.20	0.23
McKay	267	0.54	0.52	0.04	130	0.26	0.21
new 1	28	0.56	0.52	0.08	14	0.28	0.21
curr 1	39	0.50	0.52	-0.04	29	0.37	0.23
curr 1-5		0.48	0.52	-0.07		0.37	0.23
Ohrenberg	250	0.51	0.52	-0.02	110	0.22	0.21
new 1	45	0.50	0.52	-0.04	17	0.19	0.21
curr 1	52	0.55	0.52	0.05	26	0.27	0.23
curr 1-5		0.52	0.52	0.00		0.26	0.23
Trotter	271	0.51	0.52	-0.02	139	0.26	0.21
new 1	64	0.57	0.52	0.10	27	0.24	0.21
curr 1	52	0.51	0.52	-0.02	28	0.27	0.23
curr 1-5		0.53	0.52	0.02		0.26	0.23
IX 1-5	1760	0.47	0.52	-0.09	880	0.24	0.21
new 1	302	0.47	0.52	-0.09	158	0.25	0.21
curr 1	421	0.52	0.52	0.00	178	0.22	0.23
curr 1-5		0.47	0.52	-0.09		0.25	0.23

③

H	I	J	K	L	M	
Devia.	Oth Min	Percent	Ideal	Devia.	Total	
0.13	64	0.23	0.27	-0.13	273	Curley
0.01	14	0.27	0.27	0.00	52	new 1
-0.01	11	0.19	0.25	-0.23	57	old 1
0.17		0.21	0.25	-0.16		curr 1-5
0.48	24	0.11	0.27	-0.60	222	Guild
0.79	3	0.13	0.27	-0.54	24	new 1
-0.28	4	0.08	0.25	-0.67	48	old 1
0.11		0.14	0.25	-0.44		curr 1-5
0.28	42	0.22	0.27	-0.19	193	Hale
0.47	7	0.27	0.27	0.00	26	new 1
-0.13	12	0.22	0.25	-0.13	55	old 1
0.13		0.18	0.25	-0.29		curr 1-5
0.12	53	0.20	0.27	-0.24	259	Haley
0.10	10	0.19	0.27	-0.29	52	new 1
0.34	13	0.25	0.25	0.00	52	old 1
0.21		0.21	0.25	-0.16		curr 1-5
-0.15	222	0.43	0.27	0.58	519	Hennigan
-0.03	28	0.44	0.27	0.62	64	new 1
-0.41	32	0.31	0.25	0.23	104	old 1
-0.09		0.37	0.25	0.49		curr 1-5
-0.44	115	0.68	0.27	1.51	170	Hernandez
-0.68	20	0.67	0.27	1.47	30	new 1
-0.35	38	0.63	0.25	1.53	60	old 1
-0.48		0.66	0.25	1.62		curr 1-5

④

H	I	J	K	L	M	
Devia.	Oth Min	Percent	Ideal	Devia.	Total	
0.02	217	0.36	0.27	0.34	599	Jacks/M
0.49	32	0.29	0.27	0.09	109	new 1
			0.25			old 1
-0.15		0.39	0.25	0.56		curr 1-5
0.25	97	0.20	0.27	-0.27	494	McKay
0.33	8	0.16	0.27	-0.41	50	new 1
0.62	10	0.13	0.25	-0.49	78	old 1
0.59		0.15	0.25	-0.39		curr 1-5
0.07	131	0.27	0.27	-0.01	491	Ohrenberg
-0.10	28	0.31	0.27	0.15	90	new 1
0.19	17	0.18	0.25	-0.28	95	old 1
0.15		0.22	0.25	-0.13		curr 1-5
0.25	121	0.23	0.27	-0.16	531	Trotter
0.15	21	0.19	0.27	-0.31	112	new 1
0.19	22	0.22	0.25	-0.14	102	old 1
0.15		0.21	0.25	-0.17		curr 1-5
0.13	1061	0.29	0.27	0.06	3721	IX 1-5
0.18	179	0.28	0.27	0.04	639	new 1
-0.05	213	0.26	0.25	0.05	812	old 1
0.08		0.28	0.25	0.11		curr 1-5

⑤

N	O	
Blk/White		
2.22	1.12	Curley
2.45	1.01	new 1
2.54	0.89	old 1
1.93	1.17	curr 1-5
1.87	1.32	Guild
1.33	1.86	new 1
4.50	0.50	old 1
2.36	0.96	curr 1-5
1.90	1.30	Hale
1.37	1.80	new 1
2.91	0.78	old 1
2.16	1.05	curr 1-5
2.38	1.04	Haley
2.50	0.99	new 1
1.44	1.57	old 1
1.84	1.23	curr 1-5
2.14	1.16	Hennigan
1.77	1.40	new 1
4.14	0.55	old 1
2.00	1.13	curr 1-5
1.75	1.41	Hernandez
4.00	0.62	new 1
1.44	1.56	old 1
1.91	1.19	curr 1-5

93

⑥

N	O	
Blk/White		
1.98	1.25	Jacks/M
1.26	1.96	new 1
		old 1
2.13	1.06	curr 1-5
2.05	1.21	McKay
2.00	1.24	new 1
1.34	1.68	old 1
1.33	1.71	curr 1-5
2.27	1.09	Ohrenberg
2.65	0.94	new 1
2.00	1.13	old 1
1.96	1.15	curr 1-5
1.95	1.27	Trotter
2.37	1.04	new 1
1.86	1.22	old 1
2.00	1.13	curr 1-5
2.00	1.24	IX 1-5
1.91	1.30	new 1
2.37	0.96	old 1
1.92	1.18	curr 1-5

⑦

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	Black			White			OM
	IX	City		IX	City		IX
Gr 1-5	1699	10248	0.17	887	5235	0.17	994
	0.47	0.49		0.25	0.25		0.28
Gr 6-8	1520	6553	0.23	1258	4291	0.29	694
	0.44	0.48		0.36	0.31		0.20
Gr 9-12	4446	8943	0.50	3028	5535	0.55	1665
	0.49	0.50		0.33	0.31		0.18
Total	8059	27653	0.29	5513	17097	0.32	3492
	0.47	0.48		0.32	0.30		0.20

I	J	K	L	M	
		Total			
City		IX	City		
5456	0.18	3580	20939	0.17	Gr 1-5
0.26					
2929	0.24	3472	13773	0.25	Gr 6-8
0.21					
3327	0.50	9139	17805	0.51	Gr 9-12
0.19					
12715	0.27	17064	57477	0.30	Total
0.22					

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Analysis of 1983 Boston Student Assignments: Middle Schools

I have prepared a table analysing the impact of proposed assignments to the 5 & 6th grade upon the twenty-four middle schools. In this analysis (after preliminary review) I have concentrated upon two issues:

assignment of new white students for 1983-84, compared with sixth-grade white enrollment in April 1983, as an indication of desegregation effort; and

assignment of all new students, compared with all sixth-grade students in April 1983, as an indication of enrollment increase or decrease in each school.

Information is presented as follows:

C	white students assigned to sixth grade for Fall 1983
D	percent of white sixth-graders system-wide
E	total students assigned to sixth grade for Fall 1983
F	percent of total sixth-graders system-wide
G	projected percent white in sixth grade next Fall
H	"ideal" percent white for grades 6-8 in that school
I	deviation from the "ideal" ('1.0' is perfect)
J	April 1983 white sixth grade enrollment
K	percent of white sixth-graders system-wide
L	April 1983 total sixth grade
M	current percent white in sixth grade
N	current "ideal" percent white for grades 6-8
O	current deviation from the "ideal"
P	projected change in percent white
Q	percent change in percent white (N/M)
R	projected change in total sixth grade
S	percent change in total sixth grade (E-L/L)

IMPACT OF NEW ASSIGNMENTS TO THE SIXTH GRADE

The students assigned to sixth grades for Fall 1983 are 26% white, compared with a present sixth grade which is 30% white, so that a 13% decline in the white proportion in any school's entering class would not exceed the city-wide average (though of course the demographic factors vary from district to district). Considered in this light, those schools whose sixth grades are projected to remain at the same proportion white are exhibiting unusual stability, while those whose proportion white in the sixth grade is increasing (in districts I through VII) are doing very well indeed.

The Taft School in District I, the Curley, Lewis and Roosevelt in District II, the Irving and Shaw in District III, the Gavin in District VI, and the Timilty in District VII fall into this category. Of these schools, only the Lewis and the Gavin are projected to be slightly above the "ideal" in proportion white in the sixth grade, and these will be well within the 25% range allowed by the Court. More significantly, the Curley, Roosevelt, and Shaw are currently more than 25% below the ideal, and thus the entering sixth grades will have a positive impact.

How is this result achieved? In the cases of the Taft and the Lewis, more white students have been assigned for next year than there are presently in the sixth grade, resulting in an overall enrollment increase in both schools (note that not all students assigned may show up in the enrollments next Fall!).

White assignments to the Curley are slightly down, but in the context of a slight overall enrollment decrease; the Roosevelt and Irving are assigned slightly more white students, with a stable overall enrollment. The Timilty is assigned the same number of white students, but fewer minority students, while the Gavin is actually assigned fewer white students but with a drop in minority enrollment as well. The Shaw has a substantial drop in minority enrollment projected, with level white enrollment.

In short, these eight middle schools achieve a generally positive desegregation effect in very different ways.

The Lewenberg School in District III, the Cleveland, Holmes and Wilson in District V, and the Edwards and Michelangelo in District VII all project a substantial - above average - decline in white enrollment proportion in the sixth grade. In each case this reflects a decline in the number of white students assigned, with the Lewenberg and Edwards facing a strong overall enrollment decline, the Holmes and Wilson a slight one, and the Cleveland and Michelangelo a slight enrollment increase.

All six of these schools will be below the "ideal" white proportion in the sixth grade, with only the Holmes within the 25% deviation allowed by the Court. The first four, in Dorchester/Mattapan, reflect (and predict) the continuing difficulties with desegregating Burke and Dorchester High Schools, while the Edwards and Michelangelo are in Charlestown and the North End yet appear unable to attract a significant number of their white neighbors.

Of the three magnet middle schools, the King is projected to experience the most dramatic change, with a decline of nearly 50% (137 students) in the entering sixth grade; since this decline will be almost entirely among minority students, the proportion of white students is projected to increase by 50%, from 20% to 30% of total sixth grade enrollment. This reverses a trend out of compliance in recent years:

April 1983

(projected 6th)	30% white
6th grade	20.3% white
7th grade	21.3%
8th grade	25.8%

as well as a trend of increasing Black and Hispanic assignments to the school:

April 1983	Black	Hispanic
6th grade	166	65
7th grade	116	47
8th grade	89	33

and therefore is positive from a desegregation perspective.

More white students are assigned to the Mackey, with slightly fewer minority students, for a 27% increase in proportion white; a start has been made on correcting a trend out of compliance:

April 1983	
<projected 6th>	25% white
6th grade	19% white
7th grade	28% white
8th grade	35% white

As already noted, several schools are projected to have sixth grades substantially larger or smaller than the present sixth grade:

Lewenberg	-29%
Shaw	-26%
Thompson	+26%
Edwards	-26%
King	-46%

These changes occur in the context of an overall decline of "only" 8% in projected sixth grade enrollment.

SUMMARY

Middle school assignments are much less subject to desegregation decisions, under the Boston Plan, than high school assignments, with the exception of the three magnet middle schools. Eighty-nine percent of middle school students will attend a district school in September, compared with only half of high school students, and in general my analysis shows that the middle schools in each district are treated in the assignment process in a way which supports desegregation. In Districts II, V, and VII, for example, the middle schools located in the most heavily minority areas (Lewis, Holmes, Timilty) are assigned a higher proportion of white students than other district middle schools. Positive steps are also being taken at the magnet middle schools to protect their desegregation.

I see no reason why the proposed middle school assignments should not be approved.

Charles L. Glenn, Director
May 1st 1983

B	C	D	E	F
School	Assigned W 6th gr	percent of all W	Total assigned	percent of all
Edison	39	0.04	197	0.05
Taft	42	0.04	214	0.05
Curley	43	0.04	243	0.06
Lewis	24	0.02	91	0.02
Roosevelt	20	0.02	108	0.03
Irving	81	0.08	248	0.06
Lewenberg	20	0.02	100	0.03
Shaw	20	0.02	82	0.02
Rogers	53	0.05	199	0.05
Thompson	48	0.05	202	0.05
Cleveland	41	0.04	334	0.09
Holmes	31	0.03	164	0.04
Wilson	22	0.02	231	0.06
Dearborn	30	0.03	118	0.03
Gavin	57	0.06	130	0.03
McCormack	75	0.07	192	0.05
Edwards	24	0.02	166	0.04
Michelang	6	0.01	87	0.02
Timilty	26	0.03	150	0.04
Barnes	150	0.15	186	0.05
Cheverus	40	0.04	44	0.01
King	50	0.05	164	0.04
Mackey	40	0.04	163	0.04
Wheatley	32	0.03	110	0.03
Total	1014	1.00	3923	1.00

G percent white	H ideal	I deviation	J current white	K percent of all W	School
0.20	0.24	0.82	50	0.04	Edison
0.20	0.24	0.82	28	0.02	Taft
0.18	0.25	0.71	47	0.04	Curley
0.26	0.25	1.05	18	0.02	Lewis
0.19	0.25	0.74	17	0.01	Roosevelt
0.33	0.36	0.91	79	0.07	Irving
0.20	0.36	0.56	36	0.03	Lewenberg
0.24	0.36	0.68	21	0.02	Shaw
0.27	0.27	0.99	70	0.06	Rogers
0.24	0.27	0.88	39	0.03	Thompson
0.12	0.20	0.61	53	0.05	Cleveland
0.19	0.20	0.95	39	0.03	Holmes
0.10	0.20	0.48	30	0.03	Wilson
0.25	0.43	0.59	29	0.02	Dearborn
0.44	0.43	1.02	67	0.06	Gavin
0.39	0.43	0.91	102	0.09	McCormack
0.14	0.20	0.72	47	0.04	Edwards
0.07	0.20	0.34	13	0.01	Michelang
0.17	0.20	0.87	26	0.02	Timilty
0.81	0.87	0.93	187	0.16	Barnes
0.91	0.87	1.04	47	0.04	Cheverus
0.30	0.27	1.13	61	0.05	King
0.25	0.27	0.91	31	0.03	Mackey
0.29	0.27	1.08	37	0.03	Wheatley
0.26			1174	1.00	Total

L	M	N	O	
current total	current percent	current ideal	deviation	School
219	0.23	0.26	0.88	Edison
165	0.17	0.26	0.65	Taft
266	0.18	0.25	0.71	Curley
79	0.23	0.25	0.91	Lewis
109	0.16	0.25	0.62	Roosevelt
253	0.31	0.38	0.82	Irving
140	0.26	0.38	0.68	Lewenberg
111	0.19	0.38	0.50	Shaw
220	0.32	0.27	1.18	Rogers
160	0.24	0.27	0.90	Thompson
312	0.17	0.22	0.77	Cleveland
169	0.23	0.22	1.05	Holmes
245	0.12	0.22	0.56	Wilson
108	0.27	0.47	0.57	Dearborn
160	0.42	0.47	0.89	Gavin
230	0.44	0.47	0.94	McCormack
223	0.21	0.19	1.11	Edwards
82	0.16	0.19	0.83	Michelang
164	0.16	0.19	0.83	Timilty
216	0.87	0.90	0.96	Barnes
50	0.94	0.90	1.04	Cheverus
301	0.20	0.29	0.70	King
160	0.19	0.29	0.67	Mackey
127	0.29	0.29	1.00	Wheatley
4269	0.28			Total

P	Q	R	S	
change in percent	percent change	change in total	percent change	School
-0.03	-0.13	-22	-0.10	Edison
0.03	0.16	49	0.30	Taft
0.00	0.00	-23	-0.09	Curley
0.04	0.16	12	0.15	Lewis
0.03	0.19	-1	-0.01	Roosevelt
0.01	0.05	-5	-0.02	Irving
-0.06	-0.22	-40	-0.29	Lewenberg
0.05	0.29	-29	-0.26	Shaw
-0.05	-0.16	-21	-0.10	Rogers
-0.01	-0.03	42	0.26	Thompson
-0.05	-0.28	22	0.07	Cleveland
-0.04	-0.18	-5	-0.03	Holmes
-0.03	-0.22	-14	-0.06	Wilson
-0.01	-0.05	10	0.09	Dearborn
0.02	0.05	-30	-0.19	Gavin
-0.05	-0.12	-38	-0.17	McCormack
-0.07	-0.31	-57	-0.26	Edwards
-0.09	-0.56	5	0.06	Michelang
0.01	0.09	-14	-0.09	Timilty
-0.06	-0.07	-30	-0.14	Barnes
-0.03	-0.03	-6	-0.12	Cheverus
0.10	0.50	-137	-0.46	King
0.05	0.27	3	0.02	Mackey
0.00	0.00	-17	-0.13	Wheatley
-0.02	-0.06	-346	-0.08	Total

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Analysis of 1983 Boston Student Assignments: High Schools

I have reviewed the Black and White projected enrollments for each of Boston's high schools, grades 9-12; "other minority" projected enrollments require a different form of analysis, impacted as they are by TBE program assignments and the low representation of other minority students in certain districts. These issues are covered in other memoranda.

I have prepared the following charts:

Table #1
A number of white students assigned to each high school
B projected white percent in each school
C "ideal" white percent ordered by the Court
D deviation from the "ideal" (B-C/C)(1.0 is perfect)
E percent of all white students (9-12) in each school
F-J same information, for Black students
K percent of all students (9-12) in each school
L under/over-representation of white students (E/K)
M under/over-representation of Black students (J/K)

Note that the three examination schools (Latin Academy, Latin School, and Technical) are not bound by the "ideal" percentages; their desegregation is to occur through admission and retention of students. It is nevertheless instructive to consider their relation to city-wide racial proportions.

Table #2 percentage distribution of the ninth grade assigned to each high school, by race (Black, White, Oriental, Hispanic), and the actual racial proportions of each school (9-12) as of April 10, 1983

Table #3 the same information, with an additional column for each racial category, showing whether the new assignments will tend to reduce the proportion of that racial group in each school (index number below 1.0), or to increase it (index number above 1.0)

BLACK ENROLLMENT

The assignments are generally quite successful in achieving the desired Black enrollments, with Jamaica Plain, Dorchester, South Boston, and Charlestown adhering much more closely to the ideal than required of district high schools, and Boston High (with a work-study program) doing very well also.

Boston Latin School and (to a lesser degree) Latin Academy deviate very sharply from city-wide enrollment; examination of the grade-by-grade analyses over the past several years suggests a major Black retention/promotion problem at Latin School in particular. Our strict review of the new assignments can do little to desegregate unless minority students, once assigned, are retained.

I discussed the examination schools yesterday with Mr. Coakley, who tells me that the minority students admitted were rather more competitive with respect to test scores and grade point averages than in recent years; this may help with the retention/promotion problem.

English, Madison Park, and Copley Square High Schools have slightly more Black students than permitted by the Court, while Technical (though located in Roxbury) has rather fewer; the deviations are not extreme. Brighton High School is slightly high in Black enrollment by district high school standards.

East Boston High School has - by design - far more Black students than the "ideal" for its district; we have worked with the school over the years to attract minority students to a business magnet program, and will be monitoring the "special desegregation" measures there this Spring.

The analysis in Table #3 helps to explain these results. Note that a substantially smaller proportion (less than 2/3) of Black students were assigned to Burke, Dorchester, and English High Schools than are presently enrolled, while Madison Park and Boston Technical High also have a substantial projected decrease in Black proportion in the entering class.

The proportion of Black students assigned to Brighton, Jamaica Plain, Hyde Park, and Boston High Schools adhere quite closely to the present enrollments.

Increases in the Black proportion of enrollment are projected for Charlestown, South Boston, West Roxbury, East Boston, Umana Tech, all schools in solidly white neighborhoods, and in Boston Latin School.

It scarcely needs to be said that assigning particular proportions of students to a school will not guarantee the Fall enrollment, but the trends as reflected by comparison of assignments with present enrollments consistently move in the right direction.

In general, there seem to be no serious problems with projected Black enrollments.

WHITE ENROLLMENT

Jamaica Plain and Jeremiah E. Burke High Schools are assigned fewer white students than the Court's standards require, though in each case there is apparent progress. The assigned ninth grade in each case is substantially "whiter" than the upper grades, and the projected tenth grades hold out the hope that many of these assigned students will attend and continue:

Projected % White		Burke	Jamaica Plain
Assigned	9th	38.2%	24.7%
	10th	16%	19.6%
	11th	4.7%	15.6%
	12th	3%	16.8%

It might be noted that, until recently, schools like Burke and Jamaica Plain exhibited substantially higher white proportions in the upper grades; the reversal is encouraging! That it is more marked at Burke is presumably the result of the "special desegregation" measures undertaken there and at Dorchester High. These measures include, in addition to program and plant up-grading, a strict assignment of white students from District 5 to one of the two district high schools rather than to a magnet school, unless qualifying for an examination school or other special assignment.

The two schools with a technical focus - Technical and Umana - deserve credit for complying exactly with the "ideal" proportion of white enrollment; Charlestown High also does very well. It is interesting to note that the three programs serving some students grades 9-12 with special needs (McKinley, Tileston, and Horace Mann) are close to the "ideal" for both Black and white enrollment when taken together, though there is substantial variation among them.

Latin Academy and Latin School enroll substantially more than their share of white students; it is worth noting that 17% of the white students grades 9-12 attend Boston Latin School, contrasted with only 3% of the Black students in those grades.

English High, Madison Park High, and (to a lesser extent) Copley Square High violate the Court's requirements for minimum white enrollment in a city-wide school, though not to a dramatic extent. I talked yesterday by telephone with John Coakley to seek clarification on some of the high school assignment issues; he informed me that there were few white applicants to English and it was necessary to assign at least 40 white students from districts III and VIII (and 20 to Madison Park from VI and VII) involuntarily and despite their expressed preference for other schools. This number is significantly lower than in previous years, and goes some way toward answering one of the issues raised by Attorney Larry Johnson in his memorandum to me on assignments. (Note that white students who failed to return an application on time were also likely to receive mandatory assignments to these two schools.)

There is no high school with a higher white enrollment than the "ideal", except for Latin School and Latin Academy, and, apart for those two and East Boston, there is no high school with a projected white enrollment above 36%.

The analysis in Table #3B shows that white students were assigned to Jamaica Plain, Burke, Dorchester, Technical, English, and Madison Park High Schools in greater proportions than the present enrollment, while white students were assigned to several schools in white neighborhoods (West Roxbury, Charlestown, South Boston, East Boston, Umana Technical, Hyde Park and Brighton High Schools) in smaller proportions than the present enrollments. As with Black assignments, this consistent pattern shows that assignments are operating to desegregate, even though of course actual enrollments in the Fall will be the test of success.

White students were assigned to Latin School and Latin Academy in only very slightly smaller proportions than present enrollment.

CONCLUSIONS

We should continue to watch white enrollment at Burke, Dorchester and Jamaica Plain. Of critical importance will be the measures taken by the staff of each of these schools to encourage white students who received assignments to these schools - most likely against their choice - to give the schools a fair chance. The successful efforts over the summer of 1975 at the King Middle School is only one of the models available. Such recruitment efforts cannot be the responsibility of the Department of Implementation alone or even primarily; credibility will come with efforts by school-level staff and parents, and perhaps students as well.

Black enrollment at East Boston, Latin School, and Latin Academy also require constant attention. It would be my recommendation that a careful review of the impact and implementation of desegregation measures for the examination schools be carried out over the next six months, and that its results be communicated to the Court prior to hearings on possible modifications of the Student Assignment Plan. Thirty-eight percent of Boston's white high school students attend these three schools!

Madison Park and English High School deserve priority attention (consistent with your FY 1983 Operational Plan priority of urban secondary schools) to assure that they are safe environments in which a first-rate program is available. Both schools were built with state desegregation funds and have been heavily supported for program development under Chapter 636; they should be outstanding among urban high schools, rather than being schools to which students have to be assigned against their will. I understand that the Superintendent and School Committee share this concern; it is a desegregation/student assignment concern as well.

Taking apart the high school assignments, as I have the past several days, has given me an enhanced sense of the complexity of the assignment process in Boston, and of the integrity with which it is carried out. It has also made me more aware of some of the policy decisions built into the plan which deserve reconsideration.

Analysis of the preferences expressed by students leaving the eighth grade, and by students presently in certain high schools, reveals the strong popularity of certain options which cannot begin to satisfy the demand, including the Umana Technical School and the proposed International Program, while other options, including English and Madison Park High Schools, have an uneven appeal. Sound planning should give close attention to what is in effect an annual "referendum" on high school programs, and seek to offer what students are seeking - and willing to travel substantial distances to obtain. This analysis will be presented in a separate report.

I see no reason why the proposed high school assignments should not be approved.

Charles L. Glenn, Director
April 30th 1983

TABLE #1

Grades 9-12 White Enrollment

	A	B	C	D
School	White # in school	White % in school	Ideal % white	Deviation from ideal
Brighton	215	20	24	-0.17
Jamaica Plain	181	20	27	-0.26
West Roxbury	494	36	44	-0.18
Hyde Park	207	21	28	-0.25
J.E.Burke	74	14	20	-0.30
Dorchester	126	16	20	-0.20
South Boston	288	32	40	-0.20
Charlestown	161	19	21	-0.10
East Boston	732	68	87	-0.22
Boston High	187	23	28	-0.18
Latin Academy	417	51	28	0.82
Latin School	947	65	28	1.32
Technical	333	28	28	0.00
Copley Square	137	25	28	-0.11
English	383	23	28	-0.18
Madison Park	442	23	28	-0.18
Umana Tech	185	28	28	0.00
McK/Tlstn/Man	47	27	28	-0.04
	5556			

#1B

Black Enrollment

E Percent of w in system	F Black # in school	G Black % in school	H Ideal % Black	I Deviation from ideal
0.04	458	43	34	0.26
0.03	468	51	49	0.04
0.09	823	59	51	0.16
0.04	766	77	69	0.12
0.01	391	77	69	0.12
0.02	536	70	69	0.01
0.05	405	45	43	0.05
0.03	357	42	40	0.05
0.13	280	26	3	7.67
0.03	436	54	53	0.02
0.08	292	36	53	-0.32
0.17	254	18	53	-0.66
0.06	573	48	53	-0.09
0.02	311	57	53	0.08
0.07	971	57	53	0.08
0.08	1073	57	53	0.08
0.03	537	51	53	-0.04
0.01	99	56	53	0.06
	9030			

#1c

Grades 9-12

J	K	L	M	
Percent of B in system	Percent of all students	under/over white	under/over Black	School
0.05	0.06	0.64	0.85	Brighton
0.05	0.05	0.65	1.04	Jam. Plain
0.09	0.07	1.27	1.30	W. Roxbury
0.08	0.05	0.75	1.70	Hyde Park
* 0.04	0.03	0.44	1.44	J.E.Burke
0.06	0.04	0.57	1.48	Dorchester
0.04	0.05	1.04	0.90	So. Boston
0.04	0.04	0.72	0.99	Charlestown
0.03	0.06	2.20	0.52	East Boston
0.05	0.04	0.84	1.21	Boston High
0.03	0.04	1.88	0.81	Latin Acad.
0.03	0.08	2.13	0.35	Latin Sch.
0.06	0.06	1.00	1.06	Technical
0.03	0.03	0.82	1.15	Copley Sq.
0.11	0.09	0.77	1.19	English
0.12	0.10	0.80	1.19	Madison Pk.
0.06	0.05	0.67	1.19	Umana Tech
0.01				McK/Tlstn/Man

TABLE #2

SCHOOL	B assigned	B present	W assigned	W present
Brighton	42	40	18	20
Jamaica Plain	50	50	25	17
West Roxbury	65	57	28	39
Hyde Park	76	76	21	23
J.E.Burke	52	82	38	10
Dorchester	46	73	30	14
South Boston	58	42	27	32
Charlestown	54	36	10	21
East Boston	27	24	66	71
Boston High	55	55	25	24
Latin Academy	35	35	49	52
Latin School	23	20	62	63
Tech	40	49	34	29
Copley Sq	63	53	24	27
English	37	62	38	22
Madison Park	46	58	34	23
Umana Tech	56	50	24	29

#2B

SCHOOL	O assigned	O present	H assigned	H present
Brighton	10	22	30	18
Jamaica Plain	0	0	25	32
West Roxbury	1	1	6	3
Hyde Park	0	0	3	1
J.E.Burke	1	0	9	8
Dorchester	0	0	24	12
South Boston	5	12	10	14
Charlestown	15	28	21	14
East Boston	2	2	5	3
Boston High	1	3	19	17
Latin Academy	12	10	4	3
Latin School	10	13	5	5
Tech	19	17	7	5
Copley Sq	3	4	10	14
English	3	4	22	12
Madison Park	1	1	19	17
Umana Tech	10	11	10	10

TABLE #3

SCHOOL	B assigned	B present	
Brighton	42	40	1.04
Jamaica Plain	50	50	1.00
West Roxbury	65	57	1.14
Hyde Park	76	76	1.00
J.E.Burke	52	82	0.63
Dorchester	46	73	0.63
South Boston	58	42	1.37
Charlestown	54	36	1.51
East Boston	27	24	1.12
Boston High	55	55	1.01
Latin Academy	35	35	1.00
Latin School	23	20	1.19
Tech	40	49	0.81
Copley Sq	63	53	1.19
English	37	62	0.60
Madison Park	46	58	0.80
Umana Tech	56	50	1.13
	49	51	0.96

#3 B

SCHOOL	W assigned	W present	
Brighton	18	20	0.91
Jamaica Plain	25	17	1.45
West Roxbury	28	39	0.73
Hyde Park	21	23	0.90
J.E.Burke	38	10	3.82
Dorchester	30	14	2.17
South Boston	27	32	0.84
Charlestown	10	21	0.46
East Boston	66	71	0.92
Boston High	25	24	1.04
Latin Academy	49	52	0.94
Latin School	62	63	0.98
Tech	34	29	1.17
Copley Sq	24	27	0.88
English	38	22	1.71
Madison Park	34	23	1.48
Umana Tech	24	29	0.83
	32	30	1.07

#3c

SCHOOL	O assigned	O present	
Brighton	10	22	0.45
Jamaica Plain	0	0	
West Roxbury	1	1	0.50
Hyde Park	0	0	
J.E.Burke	1	0	
Dorchester	0	0	
South Boston	5	12	0.41
Charlestown	15	28	0.53
East Boston	2	2	1.15
Boston High	1	3	0.37
Latin Academy	12	10	1.19
Latin School	10	13	0.75
Tech	19	17	1.12
Copley Sq	3	4	0.65
English	3	4	0.80
Madison Park	1	1	0.70
Umana Tech	10	11	0.91
	5	8	0.72

#3 D

SCHOOL	H assigned	H present	
Brighton	30	18	1.64
Jamaica Plain	25	32	0.77
West Roxbury	6	3	2.00
Hyde Park	3	1	2.80
J.E.Burke	9	8	1.13
Dorchester	24	12	1.97
South Boston	10	14	0.73
Charlestown	21	14	1.52
East Boston	5	3	1.67
Boston High	19	17	1.09
Latin Academy	4	3	1.24
Latin School	5	5	1.10
Tech	7	5	1.32
Copley Sq	10	14	0.71
English	22	12	1.81
Madison Park	19	17	1.12
Umana Tech	10	10	0.96
	13	11	1.21

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Analysis of 1983 Boston Student Assignments: Preferences for Ninth Grade

One of the most valuable sources of information on how the Boston student desegregation plan is "working" is the functioning of student choices built into the plan. Contrary to the general impression, adoption of this plan has greatly increased the amount of choice for students in the public schools. While it is a "mandatory" plan, it builds very much upon the annual opportunity for each student to request assignment to particular schools and/or programs, subject to capacity and race desegregation considerations. In this respect, the actual functioning of the Boston Plan is not too dissimilar from that of the Cambridge Plan discussed in a recent article by my colleague Michael Alves.

This is not to say that every student receives the assignment which he wishes, or to deny that some students are assigned quite contrary to their desires. No public school system could operate on the basis of unlimited choice, and no system under a mandate to remedy past unconstitutional racial segregation can fail to control student assignments with great care to assure that they have a positive effect. Over time, however, it is reasonable to seek to increase the proportion of students who do receive their first (or second, or third) choice. In particular, if analysis should show that minority students, in particular, are significantly less likely to receive the assignments which they seek, legitimate questions might be raised about the nature and scope of the educational opportunities offered.

A large school system, after all, is not static; programs are created, and others phased out, school facilities are built or closed, high school offerings in particular are modified to respond to changing demand and evolving job markets. It is reasonable, and indeed obligatory, to ask whether these changes are made with a consistent design: to expand relevant opportunities, to make access more equal, to respond to the educational goals of students and their parents, and to assure stable desegregation.

The data available in Boston as a result of the annual assignment process could be very valuable in guiding this process, and especially so at a point when basic questions are being raised about the shape and structure of the education which will be offered in the decades ahead. In effect, the assignment applications constitute an annual referendum on desired educational opportunities, and indeed more than a referendum, since each student (or parent) is in fact indicating a choice which may well translate into a commitment. These decisions are not lightly made, and they deserve to be listened to attentatively.

THE SCOPE OF CHOICE

To describe the full range of choices, and how decisions are made as to which will be honored, would require a detailed exposition out of place here. The process is governed by Orders of the Federal Disrict Court, as stated in operational terms by the procedural manual developed by the School Department's Department of Implementation. Each student is mailed, in the early Spring of each year, an application form which is "tailor-made" to his or her particular circumstances. For example, a student in the fourth grade in a Boston elementary school is mailed an application showing only the options appropriate at his or her grade level - continuing in that school, seeking a transfer to a magnet elementary school, or (if already attending a magnet school) seeking a transfer to a "community district" school in the district where he or she lives. A high school assignment, or a bilingual program, or a kindergarten, or an elementary school in another district are not real options for that student, and so they are not offered.

On the basis of applications mailed back in a timely manner, the Assignment Unit prepares proposed assignments for each school on the basis of a hierarchy of considerations, among which race desegregation is very important but by no means exclusive. A student requiring a substantially separate special education program, for example, will be assigned to the appropriate program without regard to race. Among students similarly situated (for example, two white students vying for one space available for a white student at a particular school), assignment is made randomly; this may be affected by the impact upon the community district schools if one student rather than the other is assigned to a magnet high school, but in general impact upon the sending school is not taken into consideration (by contrast with the required procedure with magnet schools established in other Massachusetts cities under state requirements).

Needless to say, the process is more complex and more subtle than this brief description can convey, and our monitoring effort has only had a few weeks to begin to understand how it works.

THE PRESENT INQUIRY

As a matter of priority interest, I have tabulated the first preferences expressed by students entering the ninth grade in September 1983, who were already registered with the public schools by March 1983. Data on second and third choices were also reviewed selectively, but created analytical problems which precluded its being used in a general overview; such data has been used, for example, in special studies of the Tobin School and of Burke and Dorchester High Schools.

I have determined the number of students seeking to enter the ninth grade of each appropriate school or program, based upon a print-out generated by the Department of Implementation and dated April 19, 1983, by race (information by gender would also be highly interesting, but was not available). My analysis does not include the entire "universe" of potential ninth graders, since I set aside students already attending or planning to attend the three examination schools, and for other reasons as well my data may include some (I trust minor) errors of interpretation. So far as I know, this is the first study of its type in Boston, and its approach will undoubtedly benefit from refinement through criticism.

The primary options available to students planning to enter the ninth grade were these:

- attending the community district high school (in District V, one of two, Burke or Dorchester)
- seeking one of several bilingual education assignments
- English High School
- Boston High School (a work-study school)
- the new "International Program" at Copley Square High School
- Madison Park High School
- the Mario Umana Technical High School (note that most students enter this school at the 7th or 8th grade; the large number of applications from students in the 6th and 7th grades deserves separate analysis)
- the magnet music program at Madison Park High
- the business education magnet at East Boston High
- three vocational programs located in district high schools, but governed by city-wide racial goals: Brighton, Hyde Park, and West Roxbury
- special "magnet" programs at Dorchester High School

Altogether, 3725 students were included in the survey; another 805 students currently in the eighth grades of Boston Latin Academy, Boston Latin School, and Umana were not included, since the great majority expressed the desire to continue in those schools. Note that Boston currently enrolls 4551 students in grade eight.

Tables have been prepared which show, for each middle school (grades 6-8) the number of students (Black, white, and other minority) who expressed a first preference for each of the options listed above, and the number who failed to return a timely application. Another table shows the number of students actually assigned (in the proposed assignments prepared April 28, 1983) to each ninth grade, by racial/ethnic group, compared with the number expressing a first preference for that assignment.

Please note that many students undoubtedly received their second or third choice assignments; the analysis carried out to date falls far short of determining how many students received assignments against their will.

The discussion which follows raises a number of issues and suggests some tentative conclusions about the operation of student choice in admission to high schools in Boston. In particular, it focuses upon questions of equity of access to educational opportunities rather than upon desegregation as such, and should not be considered apart from the separate discussion which I have prepared on the desegregation impact of high school assignments.

One further point before discussing the preferences and assignments: a substantial number of students do not return an application (or return one late in some cases). Some may not intend to continue in the Boston public schools, many others no doubt have no preference or simply fail to follow through on the process. These "no returns" amount to 26% of Black eighth graders, 29% of white eighth graders, and 27% of other minority eighth graders; it is perhaps of some significance that the rate of no return is roughly equal for the three groups. In the assignment process these students are "available" for either a district or a magnet assignment, though not for a specialized bilingual or vocational assignment, of course.

DISTRICT HIGH SCHOOLS

The Boston desegregation plan of May 10, 1975 guarantees a community district assignment for every elementary and middle school student, but provides that high school students may be assigned to city-wide high schools if insufficient capacity exists in their community district high schools, with racial/ethnic ratios controlling such assignments. The plan was designed to assure that, in fact, sufficient space was not available in the district high schools, which represented about half of system-wide capacity, to assure that the magnet high schools - pre-eminently, English and Madison Park -

would be desegregated according to the strict standard for city-wide schools. Over the intervening years many students have been assigned to these schools despite a preference for their district high schools, a question which has been raised with me recently by Attorney Larry Johnson, counsel for the Plaintiffs in the Boston desegregation case.

To what extent are district high school assignments sought by students, and to what extent do 1983-84 assignments accommodate first preferences for these schools?

Only 12% of Black and other minority eighth graders expressed a first preference for their district high school, contrasted with 34% of white eighth graders. This marked disparity is undoubtedly attributable to the location of most district high schools in white neighborhoods, with only Burke and Dorchester located in predominantly Black neighborhoods, and Jamaica Plain in a racially-diverse area. It is, in fact, only in District V (served by Burke and Dorchester) that the number of Black students who gave the district high school as first preference plus those who failed to return an application exceeded the number actually assigned to the district high school.

I. Black Students and District High Schools

School	# First Preference	# Assigned
Brighton	15	69
Jamaica Plain	18	128
West Roxbury	76	178
Hyde Park	17	170
Burke & Dorchester	40	89
South Boston	20	118
Charlestown	10	107
East Boston	0	9

Other minority students were only relatively more positive toward district high schools, in part no doubt because the bilingual programs at most of them has created a degree of positive acceptance.

II. Other Minority Students and District High Schools

School	# First Preference	# Assigned
Brighton	7	50
Jamaica Plain	29	34
West Roxbury	8	21
Hyde Park	2	8
Burke & Dorchester	4	14
South Boston	12	5
Charlestown	8	33
East Boston	8	14

Note that only South Boston High is "disappointing" other minority studens who gave it their first preference; this is consistent with a concern to bring the enrollment of that school within the Court guidelines, after absorbing nearly a hundred additional other minority students last year through transfer of the Cambodian bilingual program to South Boston. Note also that the new ninth grade at South Boston High is projected to have a much smaller white enrollment than the current ninth grade.

If Black and other minority students are reserved about the district high schools, white students are much more enthusiastic. Only in Districts II (Jamaica Plain) and V (Burke and Dorchester) were the combined "first preferences" and "no returns" for the district high school less than the number of students actually assigned; even counting in second and third preferences, these schools were presumably assigned some white students who expressed a clear interest in going elsewhere.

III. White Students: Districts II and V

School	# First Pref	# 2nd & 3rd	# no return	# assigned
Jamaica Plain	7	11	35	63
Burke & Dorchester	4	3	48	71

Apart from these special cases - discussed in my memorandum on high school assignments, and in a separate memorandum of "special desegregaton" measures - the district high schools are popular with white students:

IV. White Students and District High Schools

School	# First Preference	# Assigned
Brighton	24	29
Jamaica Plain	7	63
West Roxbury	67	72
Hyde Park	15	37
Burke & Dorchester	4	71
South Boston	75	55
Charlestown	19	19
East Boston	158	116

For a full picture, the 74 white students who expressed first preferences for vocational programs at Brighton, Hyde Park, and West Roxbury must be added to the numbers indicated above. At the Rogers Middle School in Hyde Park, for example, only nine white students requested Hyde Park High, but 24 requested the vocational programs at Hyde Park or West Roxbury. Nevertheless, Hyde Park High School needs close watching as a potentially segregated school.

Considering the district high schools together (and this is of limited utility, because East Boston has a severely distorting effect on the aggregate), only 25% as many Black students expressed a first preference for a district school as were actually assigned to one; corresponding proportions are 50% for other minority and 88% for white students:

V. Students requesting and assigned to district schools

	# First Pref	# Assigned	% of Assigned
Black	217	868	25%
White	405	462	89%
Other Minority	89	179	50%

The equity implication of this is that district high schools serve the perceived interests of white students much more closely than they do those of minority students; note that this is not to conclude that inequities are produced, except to the extent that geographical location of most district high schools creates more of a burden of access for minority students. Receiving a first preference is not a "benefit" to which any student is entitled, but a failure to honor such preferences disproportionately for one racial group raises important policy and planning concerns.

With respect to the issue raised by Mr. Johnson, the analysis above makes it clear that few students who express a first preference for a district high school are denied it. Exceptions seem to be other minority and white students seeking to attend South Boston, and white students seeking to attend East Boston High School. To the contrary, many students - especially Black students - are assigned to district high schools despite their preference for a city-wide school.

A final question which we will ask of the data is: how "popular" is each district high school in general with the students of its geographical district? Compared with this year's ninth grade enrollment, what proportion of students are seeking to enter the school? I make the comparison with the current year (next year's projected figures are used in the charts above) because they give a sense of the actual size of each school, as compared with the hoped-for size of its new entering class. The figures given in both instances are "non-programmatic" - that is, they do not include bilingual, vocational, or substantially-separate students.

VI. Proportion of all students seeking district assignment

School	1982-3 9th	1st Pref	Proportion
Brighton	202	46	23%
Jamaica Plain	255	54	21%
West Roxbury	363	151	42%
Hyde Park	282	34	12%
Burke & Dorchester	432	48	11%
South Boston	259	107	41%
Charlestown	179	37	21%
East Boston	217	166	76%

Apart from the special case of East Boston High School - in a sense an alternative to attending a desegregated high school program - none of the district high schools is able to replace as much as half of its present 9th grade from students in district middle schools who give it as their first preference. West Roxbury and South Boston stand out as stronger than the others in this respect, with relative popularity among all three racial/ethnic categories.

It should be clear that the Court-imposed racial proportions are not a limiting factor in most of these cases; the lack of enthusiasm for district high schools extends to all three racial/ethnic groups, though more to minority than to white students.

No long-range plan for the high schools has yet been approved by the Court; the data above will be relevant to development and assessment of such a plan.

ENGLISH AND MADISON PARK HIGH SCHOOLS

In a sense, these two large facilities are a mirror image of the district high schools: minority students are much more enthusiastic about both than are white students.

English High School has been a comprehensive, college-preparatory high school serving the whole city for over 150 years. By 1972 it had become almost exclusively Black, in part as a result of feeder-school and grade level manipulations by the Boston School Committee; the then headmaster accurately predicted the effect of these measures. The state Board of Education approved funding for a new facility designed to attract a racially-balanced enrollment city-wide, and the present building was designed for 2000 students (by comparison with around 1200 for the new Charlestown, Jamaica Plain, and West Roxbury facilities). For a time the School Committee sought to use the new building for Girls Latin (now Boston Latin Academy), but the Board was successful in obtaining an injunction against that change of use. The Court has made desegregation of English High School a priority concern, and in recent months the School Committee and administration have shown special concern to resolve security and other problems which have set back desegregation as well as education.

Madison Park High School was the cornerstone of the secondary school racial balance plan developed by the school department and state desegregation planners during the decade prior to Judge Garrity's 1975 plan. Originally Madison Park was planned as a 5000 pupil campus school, drawing from the entire city; capacity was scaled down to 2500 as part of an agreement under which the state permitted construction of a new high school in West Roxbury and a replacement for Jamaica Plain High. More recently, the Humphrey Occupational Resource Center was built adjacent to Madison Park, to provide part-time skills training to students from high schools city-wide.

Both English and Madison Park are required to meet the strict enrollment standards for magnet or city-wide high schools: for 1983-84, between 49% and 57% Black, between 23% and 33% white, and between 18% and 20% other minority, with some flexibility in the last category to account for bilingual programs. In April 1983 English was 62%, 22% and 16%, while Madison Park was 58%, 23%, and 19%.

VII. Preferences for English and Madison Park

		# First Pref	# Assigned	Proportion
English				
	Black	116	125	93%
	White	22	141	16%
	Other Min	30	85	35%
Madison Park				
	Black	342	271	126%
	White	15	199	8%
	Other Min	95	108	88%

It is clear that a number of white students are being assigned to these two schools despite an expressed preference for another school, and that many of the 340 "no return" white eighth graders who did not send in a timely assignment application have been assigned to these two schools as well. Coincidentally, there are 340 white students assigned to the two schools for ninth grade, but it is predictable that many will not be in attendance in the Fall, unless effective efforts are made to reach and encourage them that the schools offer what they are seeking educationally, and in a secure environment. Frank Banks' report on safety and security monitoring will throw light on the extent of the problems in that regard.

Another question to ask of the data on English and Madison Park High Schools is whether the total number of students expressing first preferences for these schools would be sufficient to replace the present ninth grades; this is the information which we provided for district schools in Table VI.

VIII. Proportion of all students seeking English & Madison

	1982-3 9th	1st Pref	Proportion
English	544	168	31%
Madison Pk	631	452	72%

Absent desegregation requirements, then, Madison Park is clearly attractive to nearly three quarters of the students necessary to replace its present ninth grade, taking first preferences only into account; this compares very favorably with all the district high schools except East Boston. English High is much less successful in attracting first preferences, though even English attracts a higher proportion of its needed enrollment than six of the district high schools (Brighton, Jamaica Plain, Hyde Park, Burke, Dorchester and Charlestown).

I must immediately point out that the comparison is to some extent unfair, since district high schools may draw students only from their districts, while of course city-wide schools like English and Madison Park draw students city-wide. To some extent, as well, a preference for English or Madison Park may reflect primarily a desire, on the part of a minority student, not to attend a district high school in a white neighborhood perceived as "hostile".

The location of Madison Park High School is such that it could be considered a "district" high school for minority students from districts I, II, VI and VII; English High is very convenient for minority students in District I. Do these schools draw first preferences almost exclusively from contiguous areas, or is their appeal, at least for minority students, city-wide? And can we find any basis for concluding that minority students are avoiding particular district high schools by selecting Madison Park or English? That inference would be fair in instances where the city-wide schools are closer to the area of residence of most minority students than are their district schools.

The analysis which follows necessarily omits students attending magnet middle schools, since information was not available on their district of residence. It shows, for each district, the number of high school students who gave first preference to the district high school, to English, and to Madison Park. Note that "all options" includes students who failed to return a timely application; it is appropriate to include these students, since their failure to apply at least seems to indicate the lack of a strong preference for a particular option. District VIII (East Boston) has been eliminated from the analysis.

Directly under the number of students expressing first preferences for each option, I show the percent which that represents of all eighth grade students in that district.

IX. Black Student First Preferences

District & School	District	English	Madison	All Options
I (Brighton High)	15	9	20	96
	16%	9%	21%	
II (Jamaica Plain)	18	8	41	184
	10%	4%	22%	
III (West Roxbury)	76	16	42	279
	27%	6%	15%	
IV (Hyde Park)	17	24	38	237
	7%	10%	16%	
V (Burke & Dorchester)	40	34	91	442
	9%	8%	21%	
VI (South Boston)	20	7	31	162
	12%	4%	19%	
VII (Charlestown)	10	6	32	132
	8%	5%	24%	

Several tentative conclusions may be drawn from this data. One is that English High is not especially popular with Black students livin in District I, where the school is located; Madison Park (also very convenient) is substantially more popular. Madison Park is also popular for students from District V (Dorchester), despite the considerable distance involved and the availability of two district high schools located in predominanty minority areas; English High is also slightly more popular for District VI Black students than it is for those in District I, where the school is located. It is intriguing that Madison Park and English High are both somewhat less popular for students from District VI, which is closer than District V. A higher proportion of District VI Black students select South Boston High School than do District V Black students select Burke or Dorchester High Schools.

West Roxbury High is the only district high school more popular with Black students resident in its district than is Madison Park; this may in part be accounted for by distance, but note that District IV Black students, from Mattapan, at an even greater distance, are the most eager to go to English High and the least eager to attend their district high school. District VII Black students, as might be expected, give Madison Park (located in their district) the highest proportion of first preferences, followed by District II students, whose district comes within a few blocks of Madison Park.

The net effect of this analysis is to suggest that geography probably has somewhat less to do with selection of one of the city-wide schools than an aversion to the alternative, district high school, and that this aversion seems to have more to do with program or perceived quality than with location in a "friendly" or "hostile" area. Black students go substantial distances to West Roxbury and even to South Boston High Schools, but they go substantial distances to avoid Hyde Park, Burke, or Dorchester.

It would be extremely useful to test these hypotheses with interviews of eighth grade students and their parents. What are they looking for in a high school, and what are they avoiding? My analysis of first preferences can only provide suggestions . . .

X. White Student First Preferences

District & School	District	English	Madison	All Opt

I (Brighton)	24	2	1	85
	28%	2%	1%	
II (Jamaica Plain)	7	0	2	72
	10%	0%	3%	
III (West Roxbury)	67	0	0	125
	54%	0%	0%	
IV (Hyde Park)	15	2	1	73
	21%	3%	1%	
V (Burke & Dorchester)	4	6	6	119
	3%	5%	5%	
VI (South Boston)	75	7	2	206
	36%	3%	1%	
VII (Charlestown)	19	1	0	37
	51%	3%	0%	

This analysis shows that West Roxbury and Charlestown are the only district high schools which a majority of the eligible white eighth grade students in their district middle schools give as their first preference, with South Boston receiving over a third and Brighton over a quarter of the potential "votes". English High School is selected by appreciable numbers of white students who might otherwise attend Burke, Dorchester, or South Boston, with Madison Park and English each drawing more preferences than Burke and Dorchester combined from white students in District V. In no other case is English or Madison Park more popular among white eighth graders than their district high school.

There appears to be no particular pattern in white avoidance of English and Madison Park, except that white students in District V are even more eager to avoid Burke or Dorchester.

Other minority preferences do not lend themselves to comparison with those of Black and white students, since 23% of other minority eighth graders (4% of white, 2% of Black) request bilingual program assignments, including programs at English and Madison Park. The figures which follow reflect only the non-program preferences, as do the percentages.

XI. Other Minority Student First Preferences

District & School	District	English	Madison	All Non-TBE
I (Brighton)	7	1	4	51
	14%	2%	8%	
II (Jamaica Plain)	29	3	10	99
	29%	3%	10%	
III (West Roxbury)	8	2	5	31
	26%	6%	16%	
IV (Hyde Park)	2	1	0	7
	29%	14%	0%	
V (Burke & Dorchester)	4	7	23	80
	5%	9%	29%	
VI (South Boston)	12	10	23	89
	13%	11%	26%	
VII (Charlestown)	8	4	13	129
	6%	3%	10%	

This analysis of other minority student preferences reveals that Madison Park is strongly attractive to such students attending middle schools in Districts V and VI. The lower proportion from District VII reflects an unusually large number of "no returns" and of preferences for the proposed International Program at Copley Square High from the Edwards Middle School.

Jamaica Plain High receives far more first preferences than other district schools from other minority students; Burke, Dorchester and South Boston had the highest proportion of other minority students requesting either English or Madison Park.

To summarize this review of English and Madison Park High Schools, it is clear that neither is strongly favored by white students from any section of the city; both have broad support among Black and other minority students, though Madison Park significantly more so than English. Whether minority students express preference for these schools rather than for their district high schools seems to be a function of the perceived quality of the latter, and only quite secondarily of their location. In effect, the two city-wide schools seem to be the preferred "default option" for minority students who are not attracted to their district schools.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM AT COPLEY SQUARE HIGH

The Boston School Committee has voted to implement this program without seeking review by the Court, and eighth graders were given the opportunity to apply. Since Copley Square has already enjoyed a good reputation for education and for safety, it is not surprising that substantial interest was expressed:

XII. Preferences for Copley Square High

	# First Pref	# Assigned	Proportion
Black	175	95	184%
White	86	36	239%
Other Min	70	20	350%

It should be noted that the assignment unit is assigning a significantly higher proportion of Black students to the entering ninth grade than in previous years: the grade is projected as 63% Black, as compared with 55% in grades 10-12.

In view of the strong appeal of this option to all racial/ethnic groups, it seems a pity that it will not be operating in one of the schools which need improved recruitment and have a larger capacity, such as English High School. The international resources of the Back Bay are surely equalled by those of the Fenway/Medical area, and English is already offering bilingual programs in French, Spanish, and Lao! Perhaps this will be a consideration in future planning, if student interest in the international option is matched by student satisfaction.

MARIO UMANA HARBOR TECHNICAL SCHOOL

The Umana, as noted above, takes most of its students at the seventh or eighth grade; subtracting present eighth grade from projected ninth grade indicates that less than thirty more Black students can be assigned there, and few if any white or other minority students. The strong appeal of the school deserves attention, however, for its implications for future planning and program development.

XIII. Preferences for the Umana School

	# First Pref	# Assigned	Proportion
Black	158	28	564%
White	75	0	-
Other Min	35	0	-

Note that this does not include hundreds of students requesting the Umana while in the sixth or seventh grades; altogether, it is a remarkably attractive school to all racial groups. For example, 38 Black eighth graders from Hyde Park/Mattapan, at the opposite end of the city from the Umana in Est Boston, gave the Umana as their first choice for ninth grade, while only 17 asked for their district high school.

This strong support has clear implications for planning and program development. Perhaps it should be noted, at this point, that the Citywide Parents Council has some concerns about the responsiveness of the school to parent concerns, and that Jim Stanton has told me that the school has an unusually high number of students seeking to leave it. While I have no data on requests for mid-year transfers, I have looked at the requests for different assignments expressed by students entering the eighth (after one year at the Umana) and ninth (at the natural transfer point), and they do not seem to bear out the contention that the school is particularly unpopular with its students. Of the present seventh graders, three sought assignments to the Kind Middle School and four to the Mackey; of the present eighth graders, two sought assignments to English High, two to Boston High, twelve to the International Program at Copley Square, eight to Madison Park, two to the business program at East Boston High, and seven to vocational programs.

BOSTON HIGH SCHOOL

Boston High offers a work/study program to students sixteen and older, and is located in the racially-neutral Symphony area; the school draws a substantial number of applications for the tenth and higher grades. Ninth grade applications are relatively strong from each racial/ethnic group:

XIV. Preferences for Boston High School

	# First Pref	# Assigned	Proportion
Black	30	51	59%
White	22	23	96%
Other Min	15	11	136%

Presumably all the students assigned gave Boston High at least a second or third preference.

The support for this mode of secondary education should be taken into account in planning and program development.

BUSINESS MAGNET AT EAST BOSTON HIGH

While the regular program at East Boston High is under no desegregation requirements, the business magnet must meet the city-wide standards (stated above, in connection with English and Madison Park). The program receives many second and third preferences from students in East Boston middle schools, as a "second best" to East Boston High and an alternative, presumably, to an assignment to English or Madison Park.

XVI. Preferences for Business Magnet

	# First Pref	# Assigned	Proportion
Black	52	61	85%
White	21	20	105%
Other Min	12	6	200%

For discussion of this program, see our separate report on special desegregation measures.

VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS

For the purpose of this analysis I have combined the first preferences for three vocational programs, located in three different district high schools: Brighton, Hyde Park, and West Roxbury. Though located in district schools, these programs are subject to the city-wide racial requirements: 49%-57% Black, 23%-33% white, and 18-20% other minority.

XVII. First Preferences for Three Vocational Programs

District	Black	White	Other Minority
I	2	11	4
II	18	9	4
III	19	2	1
IV	28	24	0
V	28	8	0
VI	4	2	1
VII	3	0	4
VIII	0	0	0
IX	25	12	4

Total	127	74	19
% of all	7%	6%	3%

Note that other minority students are severely under-represented in first preferences for vocational education, at least for these three programs; this is consistent with state-wide patterns.

On the other hand, one of the quiet victories of the Boston desegregation plan is represented by the significant number of Black students seeking admission to cooperative vocational programs. We are preparing a separate report on this important aspect of the plan.

It should be noted that none of these programs is projected to be completely in compliance:

XVIII. Projected Vocational Program Enrollments

	Black	White	Other Minority
Permitted Range	49%-57%	23%-33%	18%-20%
Brighton			
9-12	62%	35%	3%
9 only	64%	30%	5%
Hyde Park			
9-12	54%	46%	0%
9 only	58%	42%	0%
West Roxbury			
9-12	63%	34%	3%
9 only	74%	23%	3%

These programs will receive special monitoring attention to assure that everything possible is being done to recruit and retain a desegegated enrollment, and especially other minority students. It is especially puzzling that the agriculture program at West Roxbury is projecting such a disproportionately Black entering class.

DORCHESTER HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS

The special desegregation effort at Dorchester High includes a new health careers magnet program and modifications of the existing vocational programs, now titled "architectural woodworking" and "urban retrofit". I will not discuss the programs or the recruitment effort here, but for the sake of completeness will include the first preferences expressed for the three programs, taken together.

XIX. First Preferences for Dorchester High Programs

Black	12
White	5
Other Min	4
Total	21

EAST BOSTON PREFERENCES

The two middle schools in East Boston represent a substantial proportion of the white enrollment at the eighth grade (32% of all white eighth graders not in the Latin Schools or the Umana), and thus of the students available to desegregate city-wide high schools, includig especially English and Madison Park. It is instructive to examine their expressed preferences in some detail.

XX. Preferences of Cheverus 8th Graders

	First	Second	Third
East Boston High	31	1	1
Mario Umana	2	8	14
Business (East Boston)	1	13	5
Dorchester "Magnets"	1	1	
English High		1	4
Copley (International)		1	

No return	7	17	18

XXI. Preferences of Barnes 8th Graders

	First	Second	Third
East Boston High	135	12	6
Italian Bilingual	35		
Other Bilingual	10	4	5
Mario Umana	12	25	76
Business (East Boston)	1	87	10
English High	1	1	4
Boston High		1	1
Music (Madison)	1		3
Madison Park		5	1
Vocational Programs			2
Dorchester "Magnets"			1
No Returns	26	93	120

Note how consistently these students are selecting East Boston High School and then the other East Boston options for second and third preference; very few are expressing preferences outside of East Boston.

OVERVIEW OF FIRST PREFERENCES

XXII. Percent of First Preferences for Each Option

	BLACK	WHITE	OTHER MINORITY
District High	12%	34%	12%
Bilingual Program	2%	4%	23%
English High	7%	2%	4%
Boston High	2%	2%	2%
Copley (International)	10%	7%	9%
Madison Park	20%	1%	13%
Umana	9%	6%	5%
Music (Madison)	2%	0.3%	1%

Business (East Boston)	3%	2%	2%
Vocational Programs	7%	6%	3%
Dorchester "Magnets"	1%	0.4%	1%
No Return	26%	29%	27%

To what extent are students' first preferences disappointed? While it is impossible, given data presently available, to answer precisely, it may be useful to summarize the instances in which more students of a paricular group expressed a first preference to a particular school than were assigned to that school for September 1983-84:

XXIII. Excess of First Preferences over Assignments

	# Assigned	# 1st Pref	Excess 1st Pref
South Boston High			
White	55	75	20
Other Min	5	12	7
East Boston High			
White	116	158	42
Madison Park High			
Black	271	342	71
Copley (International)			
Black	95	175	80
White	36	86	50
Other Min	20	70	50
Umana Technical			
Black	28	158	130
White	0	75	75
Other Min	0	35	35
Music (Madison)			
Black	11	37	26
Other Min	0	6	6
Business (East Boston)			
White	20	21	1
Other Min	6	12	6

Summary: Excess of Applications over Assignments

Black	307
White	188
Other Min	104

Percent of all eligible applicants (less Latins and Umana)

Black	15%
White	17%
Other Min	14%

While desegregation considerations may have had the effect that some students beyond what this analysis would suggest were not given their first preerences, in general it seems fair to conclude that only about one student in six who completes a middle school this Spring will fail to receive his or her first preference for high school, if an application was returned. If all eighth graders, including those presumably wishing to continue at Boston Latin, Latin Academy, and Umana, are included, the proportion "disappointed" falls to 15% of Black students, 13% of white students, and 12% of other minority students. Please note that it would be thoroughly misleading to conclude that 85% of Black students, for example, receive their first choice, since many fail to indicate a choice. The most that can be said is that students who express a first choice are quite likely to have that choice satisfied - provided that they do not choose the International Program at Copley Square, or the Umana Technical School.

If such a high proportion of applicants at least potentially receive their first preferences (and note that second and third preferences have not been taken into account), how is desegregation accomplished? It appears that it must be largely by assigning students who fail to express a preference. This amounts to 448 Black, 340 white, and 200 other minority students. The white students assigned to English and Madison Park, the minority students assigned to English and to district high schools are presumably drawn heavily from the "no returns".

CONCLUSIONS

The primary impression gained from close analysis of the student preferences and assignments (an analysis which deserves to be extended and improved) is of the wide range of options and the prevailing satisfaction of first preferences of those students who complete an application and return it in on time. Almost as striking, however, is the "over-popularity" of some options, and the disinclination to take advantage of others. Race emerges as a strong - though by no means exclusive - influence on the options selected.

By and large, white students prefer the district high schools to the large city-wide high schools (English and Madison Park), while minority students have the opposite pattern. No district high school has more Black students giving it as their first preference than were actually assigned there for September 1983, so that a Black student asking to attend his or her district school was essentially guaranteed an assignment there. This was true - according to Mr. Coakley - even of Burke and Dorchester High Schools, despite the dramatic reduction in initial assignments to those schools (under reconsideration at present). Black students were disappointed, in substantial numbers, if they gave Madison Park as their first preference.

White students, on the other hand, had a chance of disappointment if they asked for South Boston or East Boston High Schools, and it may be that some others were assigned to city-wide schools despite first preferences for district schools. By and large, however, white students who expressed first preferences seem to have been granted them.

Only a handful of other minority students were disappointed of their first preference for South Boston High.

Planning for educational programs and for facility utilization should take these student preferences into full account. In particular, the over-subscription of the proposed new international program and of the

Umana (and, equally important, the ability of these options to draw students of all three racial/ethnic groups) might suggest that capacity for such options could usefully be increased substantially. The strong popularity of West Roxbury and (less markedly) of South Boston High School among all racial/ethnic groups suggests that the program and image of those schools be given careful consideration. Can some of their appeal be given to the other district high schools?

This point deserves underlining. Students in Boston will choose "against expectation" a school in a location perceived as racially-hostile, and conversely reject a school in a location which is "home turf": witness the greater proportion of Black students selecting South Boston than Burke or Dorchester or the low proportion of white students in Jamaica Plain or Hyde Park selecting their district high school. What factors of school climate and educational program produce this result? It would be very important to find out . . .

Clearly, the useful distinction suggested by this analysis is not between district and city-wide schools, but between schools which many students want to attend and schools which few students want to attend. Assuming, as I think we must, that students are fairly shrewd "consumers" of educational services, except when race-related concerns about their safety play an important part - as they do for both minority and white students - we can use the data on preferences not only for diagnosis of problems but also for planning the remedies.

Charles L. Glenn, Director
June 1st 1983

BLACK School	None	District	TBE	English	Boston	Copley
New	0	3	3	0	0	5
Edison	11	6	0	5	0	8
Taft	8	9	0	4	0	7
Tobin	0	0	0	0	1	3
Curley	16	6	0	3	3	6
Lewis	14	4	0	3	0	7
Roosevelt	15	8	0	2	2	5
Irving	30	24	0	4	1	6
Lewenberg	39	29	11	4	0	6
Shaw	8	23	0	8	1	1
Rogers	15	8	0	17	1	17
Thompson	33	9	0	7	6	11
Cleveland	59	21	0	14	5	11
Holmes	26	6	0	6	0	5
Wilson	58	13	0	14	3	14
Dearborn	15	5	19	2	0	2
Gavin	21	8	0	0	2	8
McCormack	8	7	0	5	0	2
Edwards	8	4	0	0	0	5
Michelang	5	2	0	4	0	5
Timilty	26	4	0	2	3	8
Barnes	0	0	4	0	0	0
Cheverus	0	0	0	0	0	0
King	9	7	0	7	1	11
Mackey	19	8	0	4	1	11
Wheatley	5	3	0	1	0	11
Total	448	217	37	116	30	175
	0.26	0.12	0.02	0.07	0.02	0.10

Mad Pk	Umana	Music	EB:bns	Voke	Dor	Total
5	3	0	0	0	0	19
11	0	0	0	0	0	41
9	7	0	5	2	0	51
0	0	0	0	0	0	4
16	10	0	2	9	1	72
18	3	0	2	5	1	57
7	8	3	1	4	0	55
19	1	0	2	9	0	96
9	11	2	2	5	0	118
14	3	1	1	5	0	65
21	15	0	1	14	0	109
17	23	4	4	14	0	128
31	9	8	5	6	4	173
11	6	1	1	7	0	69
49	21	6	6	15	1	200
6	3	1	6	1	0	60
19	7	1	2	2	2	72
6	1	0	0	1	0	30
7	8	1	1	2	0	36
6	3	5	1	0	0	31
19	1	0	0	1	1	65
0	0	0	0	0	0	4
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20	8	2	3	18	2	88
17	3	2	2	3	0	70
5	4	0	5	4	0	38
342	158	37	52	127	12	1751
0.20	0.09	0.02	0.03	0.07	0.01	1.00

WHITE School	None	District	TBE	English	Boston	Copley
New	0	18	0	0	2	6
Edison	12	12	0	0	0	4
Taft	16	12	0	2	0	6
Tobin	1	0	0	0	0	2
Curley	20	3	0	0	0	3
Lewis	6	2	0	0	0	4
Roosevelt	9	2	0	0	0	4
Irving	19	42	9	0	0	1
Lewenberg	13	16	0	0	0	0
Shaw	12	9	0	0	0	0
Rogers	14	9	0	2	0	1
Thompson	9	6	0	0	3	0
Cleveland	20	2	0	2	5	3
Holmes	11	0	0	4	1	4
Wilson	17	2	0	0	3	7
Dearborn	14	4	1	2	0	2
Gavin	37	36	0	2	1	5
McCormack	30	35	0	3	4	3
Edwards	6	17	0	1	0	0
Michelang	4	0	0	0	0	0
Timilty	2	2	0	0	0	0
Barnes	23	128	35	1	0	0
Cheverus	7	30	0	0	0	0
King	14	7	0	1	0	7
Mackey	16	7	0	2	3	8
Wheatley	8	4	0	0	0	16
Total	340	405	45	22	22	86
	0.31	0.36	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.08

Mad Pk	Umana	Music	EB:bns	Voke	Dor	Total
1	1	0	0	6	0	34
0	1	0	1	4	0	34
1	2	1	0	7	0	47
0	0	1	0	0	0	4
0	5	0	0	4	0	35
2	1	0	1	1	0	17
0	1	0	0	4	0	20
0	2	0	0	0	0	73
0	0	0	0	1	0	30
0	0	0	0	1	0	22
1	3	0	0	24	1	55
0	0	0	0	0	0	18
0	5	1	2	5	2	47
5	5	0	1	1	0	32
1	4	0	3	2	1	40
1	3	0	1	0	0	28
0	9	0	0	0	0	90
1	7	0	3	2	0	88
0	1	0	1	0	0	26
0	2	0	1	0	0	7
0	0	0	0	0	0	4
0	10	0	4	0	0	201
0	2	0	1	0	1	41
0	3	0	0	7	0	39
1	8	0	2	5	0	52
1	0	0	0	0	0	29
15	75	3	21	74	5	1113
0.01	0.07	0.00	0.02	0.07	0.00	1.

OTHER MIN School	None	District	TBE	English	Boston	Copley
New	0	1	0	0	0	2
Edison	16	7	25	1	2	3
Taft	2	0	1	0	0	2
Tobin	2	0	1	0	0	2
Curley	12	14	23	1	1	7
Lewis	5	3	0	1	1	0
Roosevelt	20	12	14	1	0	3
Irving	4	5	15	2	0	1
Lewenberg	1	2	0	0	0	0
Shaw	1	1	0	0	0	1
Rogers	1	2	0	1	0	2
Thompson	0	0	0	0	0	1
Cleveland	22	2	22	4	0	5
Holmes	3	1	0	2	0	1
Wilson	3	1	0	1	0	1
Dearborn	8	3	3	0	2	2
Gavin	7	4	0	0	0	0
McCormack	12	5	11	10	2	1
Edwards	32	7	0	2	1	16
Michelang	14	1	0	1	1	6
Timilty	19	0	22	1	0	3
Barnes	3	7	6	0	0	0
Cheverus	0	1	0	0	0	0
King	4	6	14	0	0	0
Mackey	5	2	16	1	3	6
Wheatley	4	2	0	1	2	5
Total	200	89	173	30	15	70
	0.27	0.12	0.23	0.04	0.02	0.09

Mad Pk	Umana	Music	EB:bns	Voke	Dor	Total
1	2	0	0	1	0	7
4	0	2	0	4	0	64
0	1	0	0	0	1	7
0	1	0	0	0	1	7
6	3	0	0	4	0	71
0	0	0	0	0	0	10
4	1	0	0	0	0	55
1	1	0	4	0	0	33
0	0	0	0	0	0	3
4	2	0	0	1	0	10
0	0	0	0	0	0	6
0	0	0	0	0	0	1
16	2	2	1	0	0	76
4	3	0	0	0	1	15
3	1	0	0	0	1	11
6	4	0	1	0	0	29
7	0	0	0	1	0	19
10	3	0	1	0	0	55
5	6	1	0	2	0	72
3	0	0	0	1	0	27
5	1	0	0	1	0	52
0	2	1	3	0	0	22
0	0	0	0	0	0	1
6	1	0	2	3	0	36
5	0	0	0	0	0	38
5	1	0	0	1	0	21
95	35	6	12	19	4	748
0.13	0.05	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.01	1.00

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

TO: Ernest Mazzone, Director
Bureau of Transitional Bilingual Education

FROM: Charles Glenn CG.

DATE: April 28, 1983

RE: Boston TBE Assignments for September 1983

I picked up, this morning, a print-out of proposed assignments for Fall; John Coakley hopes that we will be able to complete our review very quickly, to permit mailing of assignment notices.

I have prepared a summary of TBE assignments (attached), showing:

District & School

language

number of students required per "cluster" according to the LauPlan

number of students in each program according to a February 1983 print-out

number of spaces (exclusive of kindergarten) approved for TBE in each school, as of March 1983 (these are the space allocations which you had a chance to comment on)

projected TBE enrollment for each school (including kindergarten); note that the projections are not broken out by language group, though in some instances it is easy to guess, for example, that "Oriental" students are in the Chinese rather than the Spanish program!

I'm sure that John Coakley would want me to point out that the enrollments are likely to change substantially between now and October, particularly at the kindergarten level.

Attorney Caroline Playter has raised several issues (see attached); these do not seem to bear directly upon assignments, but rather upon program concerns which you will undoubtedly be monitoring. Attorney Alan Rom has raised other questions, more germane to assignments per se (see attached). His concern is with under-assignment of students to certain programs, relative to the requirements of the Lau Plan. While these requirements are not explicitly included in the Order of Disengagement, it is at least arguable that they are covered by the language in IV.A.3 about our monitoring "the defendants' compliance with all terms of voluntary measures in the aforesaid areas which have not been formalized as court orders" (page 12).

In order to facilitate this analysis, I have developed a second chart which shows the "shortfall" for each program: that is, the number of students assigned less the number "required" by the Lau Plan. It will immediately be apparent that Mr. Rom has not included all of the programs which exhibit this problem, and for a good reason: it would be absurd to fault the clustering of Greek TBE students at West Roxbury High if, in fact, the cluster represents all of such students in the system!

Based on this chart, and the projected 1983-4 assignments, it appears that "under-assignment" of Spanish TBE students is anticipated at the Taft and Roosevelt Middle Schools and Dorchester, South Boston and Charlestown High Schools. I will discuss each of these five cases, and whether other alternatives might be preferable. (Underassignment of both Chinese and Spanish TBE students is anticipated at Boston High and Umana High, but the special programs of those schools must account for this.)

TAFT Middle School in Brighton is more heavily Hispanic than the other district middle school, the Edison; each is 21% white. Space is available at Taft for additional enrollment in the TBE program. The Spanish TBE program at the Edison is projected to be right at 30, so that it would not make much sense to shift students from Edison to Taft. The projected sixth grades at the two schools are 29 (Edison) and 22 (Taft), with the heavier enrollment at Edison accounted for largely by seventh graders. Short of reassigning students already in the Edison - which I assume Mr. Rom would not support - there seems little obvious remedy to the underenrollment of Taft. Note that, in fact, Taft has the makings of three reasonably-sized classes: 22, 18 and 15, and that enrollment is projected to grow from 50 to 55. My suggestion would be that we allow the proposed configuration, but ask Mr. Coakley to give priority, in assigning new students next Fall, to increasing the Spanish TBE program at Taft.

ROOSEVELT Middle School in Roxbury/Jamaica Plain is located in one of the most heavily Hispanic sections of the city, at Egleston Square. The Spanish TBE program is projected to decrease from 53 to 46, while that at the Curley Middle School, in the same district, is projected to increase from 91 to 105. While the Curley is a much larger school, it is unclear why its TBE program is growing while that at the Roosevelt declines; it may be that your staff know the reason. The School Department is proposing to assign 37 sixth graders to Curley and 21 to Roosevelt. Do you have a problem about the proposed assignments?

DORCHESTER High School is not located in an area of especially heavy Hispanic concentration, and most of the Hispanic students are assigned there for TBE. The Spanish TBE program is projected to grow from 64 to 75, still well below the Lau standard. Last year it was strongly urged that the Spanish TBE program from Charlestown High be transferred to Dorchester; the main difficulty with this is that Dorchester is already 84% minority (70% Black), and adding more Hispanic students from outside of the area would have made it even more difficult to implement "special desegregation" measures. There appears to be a real effort to build up the TBE program at Dorchester, with 33 assigned to the 9th grade. My recommendation would be either to support this gradual approach or to consider assigning the program to South Boston High.

SOUTH BOSTON High School and CHARLESTOWN High School have small Spanish TBE programs, in areas with very few Hispanics and a history of hostility to minority persons. Reluctance has been expressed to have additional Spanish TBE students assigned to either of these schools, with a preference expressed for Dorchester High; as I have explained, this would have a negative impact upon desegregation. Consolidation of the two programs in one of these two schools, however, would be more acceptable, if in your judgment and that of your colleagues in Boston this would permit a significant strengthening of the programs. You are well aware of the issues around the level of program support at Charlestown, and I'm sure it will be included in your monitoring plans.

CONCLUSIONS

Mr. Rom has raised an important issue, but without proposing a remedy. I note that, of the nine high school Spanish TBE programs in Boston, eight have fewer than 100 students (seven fewer than 80). I would be glad to react to proposals for a reallignment of these programs, but this would have to be dealt with in connection with approval of the space matrices rather than of assignments. Given the present distribution of such programs (with an average of 64 students each) there is no way that the assignment process can satisfy the requirements of the Lau Plan.

Please let me know Friday or Monday morning if you have any concerns about student assignments on the basis of the charts.

TBE/Sch	Lang	Lau Plan	Feb 83	Matrix	Fall 83	under standard
I		excl K	incl K	excl K	incl K	
Brighton	Span	100	70	265	84	-16
	Viet	100	151		88	-12
Edison Md	Span	80	76	170	80	0
	Viet		50		45	45
Taft Midd	Span	80	50	95	55	-25
Baldwin E	Chi	80	108	125	81	1
Gardner E	Span	80	125	165	126	46
Hamilton	Khmer	80	122	125	66	-14
Tobin Ele	Span	80	141	125	150	70
Winship E	Span	80	112	125	98	18
II						0
JP High	Span	100	115	140	112	12
Curley Md	Span	80	91	115	105	25
Lewis Mid	reserve			95		0
Roosev Md	Span	80	53	95	46	-34
Agassiz E	Span	80	212	185	195	115
Ellis Ele	Span	80	113	125	90	10
Kennedy E	Span	80	118	125	169	89

TBE/Sch	Lang	Lau Plan	Feb 83	Matrix	Fall 83	under
III						0
W Rox Hi	Greek	100	43	40	39	-61
Irving Md	Greek	80	21	155	23	-57
	Khmer	80	55	combined		-80
	Lao	80	34		94	14
Lewenb Md	French	80	62	75	46	-34
Lee Elem	Span (k)		12		2	2
	reserve			125		0
Mattahunt	Greek	80	76	250	84	4
	Span	80	85		77	-3
IV						0
Shaw Elem	Fr (k)		10		2	2
V						0
Dor Hi	Span	100	64	120	75	-25
Cleve Md	Span	80	79	115	91	11
S Greenwo	Span	80	74	125	80	0
Holland E	Span	80	116	125	99	19
Marshall	Span	80	115	125	110	30
Murphy El	French	80	163	185	148	68

TBE/Sch	Lang	Lau Plan	Feb 83	Matrix	Fall 83	under
VI						0
South Bos	Span	100	47	200	57	-43
	Khmer	100	94		88	-12
Dearborn	C.Verd	80	109	140	92	12
McCormack	Span	80	77	95	67	-13
Condon El	C. Verd	80	200	310	101	21
	Span	80	89		96	16
Dever Ele	Span	80	97	125	104	24
Emerson	C. Verd		41		3	3
Russell E	Span	80	82	125	74	-6
Tynan Ele	C. Verd			125	107	107
Winthrop	Span		27		1	1
VII						0
Charlest	Chi	100	210	340	146	46
	Span	100	60		65	-35
Edwards M	Chi	80	99	115	93	13
Timilty M	Span	80	65	115	85	5
Blackston	Span	80	208	250	208	128
Eliot Ele	reserve			125		0
Hurley El	Span	80	75	125	61	-19
Kent Elem	Chi	80	140	185	127	47
Quincy El	Chi	80	180	205	204	124

TBE/Sch	Lang	Lau Plan	Feb 83	Matrix	Fall 83	under
VIII						0
East Bos	Ital	100	112	100	130	30
	reserve			100		0
Barnes Mi	Ital	80	73	115combined		-80
	Port	80	25		110	30
	Span	80	22			-80
Otis Elem	Ital	80	70	204combined		-80
	Port	80	60		152	72
	Span	80	38			-80
IX						0
Boston Hi	Chi	100	16	90	8	-92
	Span	100	40		42	-58
English H	French	100	292	410combined		-100
	Span	100	82		246	146
	Lao	100	47		45	-55
Madison P	C. Verd	100	170	300combined		-100
	Port	100	11		218	118
	Span	100	78			-100
Umana	Chi	100	27	80	17	-83
	Span	100	19		28	-72
King Mid	Span	80	78	95	84	4
Mackey Md	Span	80	75	75	93	13
Hennigan	Span	80	95	125	182	102
Hernandez	Span	80	110	165	124	44
Jackson M	Viet	80	171	185	138	58
McKay	Ital	80	87	150	73	-7
	reserve			60		0
Ohrenberg	Lao	80	51	60	47	-33
						0

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Analysis of 1983 Boston Student Assignments: Alan Rom's Concerns

In a letter dated April 19, 1983 to Dr. Oliver Lancaster, Attorney Alan Jay Rom raised concerns about the proposed student assignment plan on behalf of the Bilingual Master Parents Advisory Council. Although this group is not a party to the desegregation case, we are naturally concerned to treat any issue which they raise with the utmost care. I have talked with Mr. Rom twice about the problems raised in his letter, and have prepared a memorandum to Ernest Mazzone reviewing the facts and suggesting a strategy for dealing with these problems.

The essential difficulty is that several bilingual programs enroll fewer students than required by the Voluntary Lau Plan, an agreement between the Master PAC and the Boston School Committee. While state law and regulations do not create the same requirement (and we have no responsibility to enforce the Lau Plan), it is good educational sense and a rule-of-thumb of the Bureau of Transitional Bilingual Education to seek to concentrate bilingual students in large enough "clusters" to assure an adequate program. This is particularly critical at the high school level, where a diversity of educational specialties must be offered to provide students in a bilingual program an educational experience comparable to that of students who are not in such a program.

As detailed in my April 28, 1983 memorandum to Mr. Mazzone (which I will not repeat here), there are in particular a number of Spanish bilingual programs in high schools which enroll fewer than 100 students each. Using projections for Fall 1983:

Brighton High	84
Jamaica Plain High	112
Dorchester High	75
South Boston High	57
Charlestown High	65

Boston High	42
English High	57
Madison Park High	77
Total	569
average	71

It is clear that with eight programs and only 569 students, most programs cannot meet the 100 student minimum. Since no evidence has been presented that a significant number of Spanish-dominant students are not being served by high school bilingual programs, the only choices are (a) to accept a smaller enrollment than the "ideal", with concomittant costs but also perhaps advantages of pupil/teacher ratio; or (b) to consolidate at five or six high schools rather than eight.

I have suggested that Mr. Mazzone work with Boston bilingual program staff - and encourage them to involve the Master PAC - to develop program recommendations for the Spanish high school programs. If these recommendations would require moving or consolidating programs, there would then need to be a review by Mr. Coakley and by me, and possibly formal negotiations of a modification of the student assignment plan.

Note, in this connection, the relation between these bilingual program arrangements and the current proposals to restructure secondary education in a radical manner; no hasty steps should be taken which might require moving students a second time in 1984-85. At the same time, it would be appropriate to consider placement of a Spanish bilingual program in a technical school, an "international" school, or a classical high school, for academically talented Hispanic students.

Charles L. Glenn, Director
May 10th 1983

LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER LAW
OF THE BOSTON BAR ASSOCIATION
294 WASHINGTON STREET • BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108 • (617) 482-1145

Steering Committee
Nicholas U. Sommerfeld, Chairman
Hugh R. Jones, Jr., Vice-Chairman

Edward J. Barshak
G. d'Andelot Belin
Roberta F. Benjamin
Arthur I. Berney
Daniel B. Bickford
Mark S. Brodin
Judith O. Brown
Charles C. Cabot, Jr.
Judith Nelson Dilday
Robert E. Fast
Joseph D. Feaster, Jr.
J. Harold Flannery
Thayer Fremont-Smith
John B. French
Nancy Gertner
Roy A. Hammer
James A. P. Homans
William P. Homans, Jr.
Laurence M. Johnson
Don M. Kennedy
Hans F. Loeser
James F. McHugh
Frank I. Michelman
Cornelius J. Moynihan, Jr.
Robert A. Murphy
Douglas A. Nadeau
John A. Pike
Caroline B. Playter
Barbara J. Rouse
Joseph D. Steinfield
Daniel D. Sullivan
Thomas V. Urmy
John Taylor Williams
Zipporah Batshaw Wiseman

Executive Director
Judith Bernstein Tracy

Staff Counsel
Alan Jay Rom
Peggy A. Wiesenberg

Director, Project to Combat Racial Violence
Robert P. Sherman

Office Manager
Karen T. Horner

April 19, 1983

Dr. Oliver Lancaster
Deputy Superintendent,
Curriculum & Instruction
Boston Public Schools
26 Court Street, 8th Floor
Boston, MA. 02108

Re: Proposed Student Assignment Plan - Bilingual Program Students

Dear Dr. Lancaster:

I have reviewed the proposed student assignment plan for bilingual program students and I wish to inform you, as counsel for the Bilingual Master Parents Advisory Council, that there are several violations of the Voluntary Lau Compliance Plan. Tasks 5.1.4, 5.2.1 and 5.3.1 require a minimum number of 80, 80 and 100 bilingual program students of the same linguistic group, at the elementary, middle, and high school levels, respectively, to be assigned. The proposed bilingual program student assignments, listed below are therefore in violation:

School	Language	# of Bilingual Program students assigned	Corrected level
Brighton High School	Spanish	60	100
Edison	Spanish	63	80
Taft	Spanish	49	80
Roosevelt	Spanish	57	80
Dorchester High School	Spanish	80	100
South Boston High School	Spanish	52	100

School	Language	# of Bilingual Program students assigned	Corrected level
McCormack	Spanish	62	80
Timilty	Spanish	62	80
Barnes	Spanish	19	80
Otis	Italian	54	80
Otis	Spanish	33	80
English High School	Spanish	64	100
Madison Park High School	Spanish	75	100

Certainly there is a sufficient number of Spanish bilingual program students at each level (elementary, middle and high school) to have proper clusters as is required. Tasks 5.1.4, 5.2.1 and 5.3.1 provide the proper remedy when there is an insufficient number of students enrolled citywide and that is not in issue here.

In addition, you should note that providing two bilingual teachers and an aide for the Greek bilingual program high school students does not provide equal educational opportunities for these students. Are the two teachers certified to teach all subjects that other students have the opportunity to take? I think not.

As I also mentioned to you, the issue of retaining Assistant Headmasters Bilingual at East Boston, Dorchester, Jamaica Plain, Madison Park and South Boston High Schools is critical to the successful delivery of services at the high school level. This is especially true given the reduction of the number of Bilingual Coordinators. The improper clustering of students exacerbates this problem.

I look forward to your prompt attention to these matters so these students' schedules for next school year will be corrected and stability will prevail on these issues.

Sincerely,

Alan Jay Rom

cc: Necker E. Objio
Carmen Pola
Attorney Caroline B. Playter
Raffael DeGruttola

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF IMPLEMENTATION
John R. Coakley, Senior Officer

DEC 14 1981

December 9, 1981

MEMORANDUM

To: Raffael DeGruttola
From: John Coakley John Coakley
Subject: Spanish Bilingual Program at Charlestown High School

Upon receipt of your November 4th memorandum and after inquiries from Ms. Playter, I directed staff to provide me with the recent history of Spanish bilingual enrollments at the secondary school level and to share insights with me.

I trust that you would agree with the following selected analysis:

Spanish Bilingual Education	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82
Total Enrollment, K to 12	3440	3745	3884	3854
Total Enrollment, gr. 9 to 12	581	605	512	697
Total Capacity, gr. 9 to 12	680	720	820	875*
District IX Enrollment, gr. 9 to 12	272	319	258	336
District IX Capacity, gr. 9 to 12	350	330	300	405*
District VII Enrollment, gr. 9 to 12	99	91	72	39**
District VII Capacity, gr. 9 to 12	80	80	120	100*
Total Enrollment, gr. 6 to 8	682	644	796	815
Total Capacity, gr. 6 to 8	660	810	1000	1278*
District VII Enrollment, gr. 6 & 7	66	61	67	55
District VII Enrollment, gr. 8	25	23	31	35
District VII Capacity, gr. 6 to 8	140	140	120	150*

* Includes recent increase in student-teacher ratio
** As of 11/30/81; 11 discharges submitted thereafter; new total = 28

It would appear that

1) The total enrollment of Spanish Bilingual students has been fairly constant for two years
2) the high school enrollment of Spanish Bilingual students across the system has increased
3) the middle school enrollment of Spanish Bilingual students across the system has increased
4) the Spanish Bilingual enrollment in District VII middle schools is fairly constant, and has increased at grade eight
5) the Spanish Bilingual enrollment in the District VII high school dropped significantly this year
6) the Spanish Bilingual enrollment in the District IX high schools increased significantly this year

I also assume that you agree or do not disagree with the following:

1) at least since 1978 complete K to 12 programs have been offered to Spanish bilingual students in Districts I, II, VI and VII and since 1979 in District V
2) magnet options (grades 9 to 12) have been available to Spanish bilingual students at English High School, Madison Park High School and Boston High School
3) the majority (31 of 54) of the Spanish bilingual students at Roxbury High School last spring took advantage of the magnet school priority afforded to students in the 27 closed schools
4) given the reality of the one-time-only priority to Roxbury High School students, the Spanish Bilingual Education Program at Charlestown High School is actually a start-up program
5) approximately 73 Spanish bilingual students in the three magnet high schools are District VII residents

I further assume that you may not agree with the following views of those of us in the Department of Implementation:

1. Since 1977 there were efforts made to encourage Spanish Bilingual students not to attend South Boston High School with the result that the Personnel Office assigned fewer teachers, thus causing advocates to charge us with non-compliance.
2. a similar situation seems evident in the case of Charlestown High School

We in the Department of Implementation believe that

1. sufficient numbers of Spanish Bilingual students reside within District VII to warrant full programs for K to gr. 12 within the district

2. middle school assignments (for three grades) justify a high school program (for four grades) in the district
3. the priority to Roxbury High School students seeking District IX assignments was a one-time only priority
4. consolidating the District VII program at Dorchester High School would probably overcrowd that school if students were encouraged to attend. (Presently there are only 9 seniors out of 71 students in Dorchester's Bilingual Education Program; also there are 31 eighth graders in District V Bilingual Education Program.)
5. if the desegregation order requires those Hispanic students who are not in Bilingual Education to attend Charlestown High School then Hispanic students who are in Bilingual Education should not be encouraged to create an exemption from assignment to the district high school

Accordingly, it is our intention to do the following:

a) cease making new assignments in Spanish Bilingual Education at Madison Park High School and English High School this school year

b) retain the Spanish Bilingual Education Program at Charlestown High School

d) ask you to join with the Department of Implementation's External Liaison Unit, the Community Superintendent and the staff of Charlestown High School to develop an outreach program to increase the enrollment of the Spanish Bilingual Education Program at the school

e) urge the two Deputy Superintendents to assign an additional teacher in the Spanish Bilingual Education Program at Charlestown High School in view of the fact that it is in a quasi "start-up" mode.

My responses of late have not been rapid. However, in each case I have been endeavoring to have our staff research and analyze before arriving at a recommendation or decision.

JC:ab

xc: Robert Peterkin
Rosemarie Rosen
Bernice Miller
John McGourty
Robert Murphy
Roger Beattie
Robert Dentler
Henry Dinger
Catherine Ellison

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

TO: Roger Brown, Associate Commissioner
Division of Special Education

FROM: Charles Glenn CG.

DATE: April 29, 1983

RE: Boston Substantially Separate Assignments

Yesterday I received the proposed 1983-84 assignments, with the request that I complete the review within a couple of days so that assignments can be mailed out. I have reviewed special education assignments only to the extent of "spot checking" for under- and over-representation of students in substantially separate programs. I am aware that the Division has a more sophisticated way of conducting such reviews, and has in fact been monitoring Boston closely. The results of my review are shown on the attached chart.

It appears that Black students are seriously over-represented in substantially-separate programs, perhaps because (as we found in a joint review several years ago) white students more commonly receive private school placements. Hispanic and Asian students are seriously under-represented, perhaps because programs are not available to meet their language needs.

This situation - if I have interpreted it correctly - is not correctable by the assignment process, and I do not plan to hold up the assignments while we investigate it further. I thought I should call it to your attention, however, since it may support what your staff have already found. I will of course be glad to let them use the assignment information when I have completed the approval process.

Substantially Separate Assignments for 1983-84

District 1	Distribution by race	Percent of sub sep	Sub sep % of racial group
Black	31.2	55.6	8.6
White	21.3	25.3	6
Oriental	18.6	2.2	1
Hispanic	26.6	16.9	4.6
District 2			
Black	43.3	61.2	6.8
White	20.3	20.6	4.9
Oriental	1	.5	2.2
Hispanic	35	16.8	2.3
System			
Black	47.2	56.6	5.7
White	30.5	33.3	5.2
Oriental	6.4	.7	.5
Hispanic	15.4	9.1	2.8

Racial distribution in district

racial distribution in sub. sep. program in district

% of racial group in district in sub. sep. programs

CG 4/29/83

CENTER FOR LAW AND EDUCATION, Inc.

Gutman Library, 3rd Floor
6 Appian Way
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
617-495-4666

April 6, 1983

Dr. Charles Glenn
Bureau of Equal
 Educational Opportunity
Department of Education
1385 Hancock Street
Quincy, MA 02169

Re: Morgan v. McCluskey
Student Assignments

Dear Dr. Glenn:

There are three areas of special concern to Plaintiffs, where in the past the School Defendants have violated various orders of the federal court. They are: 1) the assignment and non-assignment of students in need of special education, so that they are not enrolled in programs that satisify their individual education plans; 2) the assignment of students to District IX schools, which results in the racial ratio at the sending community district school not being in compliance; and 3) the involuntary assignment of students to District IX schools, when there is space available in their community district school.

I would appreciate your attention to these matters, as you review the Boston students assignments for the 1983-84 school year.

Sincerely,

Larry J. Johnson

Larry J. Johnson, Esq.

cc: Robert Blumenthal, Esq.

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Analysis of 1983 Boston Student Assignments: Compliance with Percent Range

Over the years since the 1975 Desegregation Plan was ordered, the most commonly-cited measure of desegregation compliance has been the range established for each district within which the percent of Black, white, and other minority students should fall. Schools have been considered "out of compliance" in one, two, or all three of the categories, through exceeding or falling below the percentage range.

In 1982 the Court allowed a change in the method of calculating this permitted ranges, with none of the parties objecting to the new method proposed by the Boston School Department. For several years I had been arguing that the earlier method made it simply impossible to achieve "desegregation" in many instances. Attached to this report is a copy of the memorandum from John Coakley to John Canty, establishing the target ranges for each district and grade level for 1983-84, under the new guidelines.

Even in its amended form, I would caution against over-reliance upon this approach to assessing desegregation progress. As my detailed reports have shown, it is important to take into account a variety of factors, including the trends in enrollment in a school and the desirability, in some instances, of "over-assigning" students of a particular group to a school which otherwise might not be stably desegregated (the Higginson School in District II is an example). The Court has also allowed considerable latitude in assigning bilingual programs to the schools which can best accommodate them, even if some negative impact on overall racial/ethnic proportions is experienced. Finally, the kindergarten enrollments have a substantial impact upon overall proportions, even though these students are not counted in "compliance". In more than one school there are more white students in kindergarten than in grades 1-5 combined! The "assignment" of these students to first grade - even though experience shows that many of them will attend parochial schools - creates an artificially-high white enrollment projection for many elementary schools. Some of the schools projected to be too high in white enrollment in September will almost certainly not be, while others which are projected to be in compliance will undoubtedly fall short when actual attendance is taken.

In the chart which follows, "other minority" non-compliance, generally deriving from bilingual (TBE) programs, is not indicated.

"Out of Compliance" Schools (projected 1983-84)

District & School		Permitted	Projected (less K)	Comment
I				
Baldwin				
	Black	22%-36%	21%	TBE impact
	White	14%-24%	10%	TBE impact
Farragut				
	Black	22%-36%	37%	
Gardner				
	Black	22%-36%	21%	TBE impact
	White	14%-24%	26%	
Garfield				
	White	14%-24%	33%	
Winship				
	Black	22%-36%	20%	TBE impact
II				
Curley Middle				
	White	19%-31%	16	TBE impact
Lewis Middle				
	Black	34%-58%	62%	problem?
Roosevelt Middle				
	White	19%-31%	18%	
Higginson				
	White	16%-26%	28%	
Kennedy				
	Black	32%-54%	28%	TBE impact
	White	16%-26%	11%	TBE impact

Manning				
	White	16%-26%	28%	
Parkman				
	White	16%-26%	29%	
III				
Lewenberg Middle				
	Black	42%-70%	73%	problem?
	White	27%-45%	24%	problem?
Shaw Middle				
	Black	42%-70%	73%	problem?
	White	27%-45%	18%	problem?
Bates				
	White	22%-36%	46%	problem?
Lyndon				
	White	22%-36%	51%	only 79 students 1-5!
Philbrick				
	White	22%-36%	38%	
IV				
Thompson Middle				
	White	20%-34%	19%	
Channing				
	White	16%-28%	32%	
Conley				
	White	16%-28%	39%	problem?
Grew				
	White	16%-28%	33%	
Hemenway				
	White	16%-28%	36%	only 75 students 1-5!
Roosevelt				
	White	16%-28%	43%	problem?
Shaw				
	White	16%-28%	36%	

V				
Burke High				
	White	15%-25%	14%	shows improvement
Cleveland Middle				
	White	15%-25%	12%	
Wilson Middle				
	White	15%-25%	11%	
Everett				
	White	10%-18%	21%	
Kenny				
	White	10%-18%	21%	
Mather				
	White	10%-18%	22%	
Murphy				
	White	10%-18%	20%	
VI				
Dearborn Middle				
	White	32%-54%	27%	problem?
	Black	28%-46%	60%	problem?
Emerson				
	White	28%-46%	23%	problem?
Perkins				
	White	28%-46%	55%	problem?
Perry				
	White	28%-46%	56%	problem?
Tynan				
	Black	28%-46%	59%	TBE impact (CV)
Winthrop				
	White	28%-46%	54%	deseg effort

VII				
Michelangelo Middle				
	White	15%-25%	12%	problem?
Eliot				
	White	11%-19%	9%	problem?
Prescott				
	Black	30%-50%	29%	
	White	11%-19%	26%	problem?
IX				
Guild				
	Black	49%-55%	58%	problem?
	White	16%-26%	31%	problem?
Hennigan				
	Black	49%-55%	38%	TBE impact
Hernandez				
	Black	49%-55%	21%	TBE impact
	White	16%-26%	12%	TBE impact
Jackson Mann				
	Black	49%-55%	42%	TBE impact

The following schools seem to me (by an admittedly somewhat subjecive standard) to be the ones with desegregation compliance problems:

Lewis Middle
Bates
Burke High
Perkins
Eliot
Lewenberg Middle
Conley
Dearborn Middle
Perry
Prescott
Shaw Middle
Roosevelt Elem
Emerson
Michelangelo Middle
Guild

As noted above, I would urge that limited weight be put upon this analysis alone; only more detailed study (as in my report on magnet elementary schools) can determine whether a serious problem exists at these - or other - schools.

It is difficult to fault Cleveland and Wilson Middle Schools for falling below 15% white, when the combined middle school enrollment in District V is only 13.6% white!

I would call attention to four elementary schools, all in predominantly white areas, with very small number of students in grades 1-5: Lyndon (79), Hemenway (75), O'Hearn (72), and Perry (81). It may be that these schools operate primarily to serve white kindergarten students in their areas: Lyndon (56), Hemenway (22), O'Hearn (44 - 2 minority), and Perry (3).

It is important to stress that this analysis has been based upon projected enrollments for Fall 1983, and that these projections probably - based upon past experience - include many white students currently in kindergarten who will not continue on in public first grade, but instead attend parochial or private schools. Some fifth graders and eighth graders will also most likely not accept their new middle and high school assignments. Perhaps the most critical - and neglected - area of desegregation implementation is the effort to persuade the parents of these students, on an individual basis, to stay with the Boston Public Schools.

All things considered, fifteen schools with "compliance problems" - even if Fall enrollments reveal a few more - seems a great improvement over the extreme racial separation which characterized the Boston schools before the 1974 racial balance plan went into effect. Compared with the heavy concentration of Black students in schools more than 90% Black, and of white students in schools more than 90% white, it is clear that Boston has achieved a significant degree of desegregation. Whether full compliance has been achieved, of course, is for the Court to say.

Charles L. Glenn, Director
May 16th 1983

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
John R. Coakley, Senior Officer

Include reverse of page

April 12, 1983

MEMORANDUM

To: John Canty

From: John Coakley John Coakley

Subject: Racial/Ethnic Percentage Goals for 1983-84

This is to formalize what I already have conveyed to you. The racial/ethnic percentage goals for 1983-84 were developed from a "geocode-loading" printout of April 5, 1983.

For the record, the computations were based on the Federal Court's March 24, 1982 approval of our March 15, 1982 filing, and the Court's April 20, 1982 approval of a filing on or shortly after April 5, 1982 pertaining, among other things, to the formulation of the percentage goals for the Humphrey Center. Please note that the permissible percentage variation for racial groups in a school in the citywide district or in the Humphrey Center has been developed in accordance with the Court Order of May 10, 1975. That computation was correctly determined for 1982-83 after some years of minor misinterpretations.

ab
Enclosure

xc: Catherine Ellison
Lydia Francis
Jack Yessayan
Charles Glenn
Franklin Banks

179

		Elementary			Middle			High		
		B	W	O	B	W	O	B	W	O
District I	H	36	24	65	35	30	60	43	30	53
	I	29	19	52	28	24	48	34	24	42
	L	22	14	39	21	18	36	25	18	31
District II	H	54	26	45	58	31	36	61	34	30
	I	43	21	36	46	25	29	49	27	24
	L	32	16	27	34	19	22	37	20	18
District III	H	78	36	11	70	45	10	64	55	6
	I	62	29	9	56	36	8	51	44	5
	L	46	22	7	42	27	6	38	33	4
District IV	H	91	28	6	88	34	4	86	35	4
	I	73	22	5	70	27	3	69	28	3
	L	55	16	4	52	20	2	52	21	2
District V	H	86	18	21	83	25	18	86	25	14
	I	69	14	17	66	20	14	69	20	11
	L	52	10	13	49	15	10	52	15	8
District VI	H	46	46	33	46	54	25	54	50	21
	I	37	37	26	37	43	20	43	40	17
	L	28	28	19	28	32	15	32	30	13
District VII	H	50	19	56	50	25	50	50	26	49
	I	40	15	45	40	20	40	40	21	39
	L	30	11	34	30	15	30	30	16	29
District VIII	H	3	99	20	3	99	14	4	99	13
	I	2	82	16	2	87	11	3	87	10
	L	1	61	12	1	65	8	2	65	7
District IX	H	55	26	29	54	32	24	57	33	20
	I	52	21	27	51	27	22	53	28	19
	L	49	16	25	48	22	20	49	23	18

		B	W	O
ORC	H	60	28	22
	I	56	23	21
	L	52	18	20

ORIGINAL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

TALLULAH MORGAN, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
V.
JEAN SULLIVAN McKEIGUE, et al.,
Defendants

C. A. No. 72-911-G

ORDER

The School Defendants have proposed certain changes in the rules for computing the racial/ethnic percentages used in determining compliance with this Court's student assignment orders. A copy of this proposal is attached to this order. Since there appears to be no opposition to this proposal, it is hereby adopted, and prior orders are modified to conform to this proposal to the extent they are inconsistent with it.

W. Arthur Garrity, Jr.
W. Arthur Garrity,Jr.
District Judge
3/24/82

ORIGINAL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

TALLULAH MORGAN, et al., Plaintiffs, v. JEAN SULLIVAN McKEIGUE, et al., Defendants.	*	C. A. No. 72-911-G

MOTION FOR MODIFICATION OF ASSIGNMENT ORDERS

The School Defendants move that the Court approve the modifications to its student assignment orders contained in its proposal filed with the Court on March 10, 1982. No party has stated objections to this proposal and the School Defendants believe that the parties are in agreement that the revised method of computing the racial/ethnic percentages applicable to the Boston Public Schools should be adopted.

A draft order is submitted for the convenience of the Court.

Respectfully submitted,

THE SCHOOL DEFENDANTS,

By its attorneys,

Marshall Simonds, P.C. (HCD)

Henry C. Dinger

Marshall Simonds, P.C.
Henry C. Dinger
GOODWIN, PROCTER & HOAR
28 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
(617) 523-5700

Dated: March 15, 1982

182

3/8/82

PROPOSAL

Racial/Ethnic Percentage Goals

I. Assignments to Community District Schools

A. It shall be the goal of the School Department to assign students to a school in a community district so that the school shall reflect the percentages of black, white and other minority students of the appropriate grade level (i.e., grades 1 to 5, 6 to 8, 9 to 13).

B. The permissible percentage variation for racial/ethnic groups in a school of a community district shall continue to be 25 percent above and below the ideal.

C. Extended Day Kindergartens shall reflect the percentages of black, white and other minority students in grades 1 to 5 of the separate districts. However, the Extended Day Kindergarten of District VIII shall continue to have an enrollment which is 20% black and other minority.

D. The racial/ethnic percentages which shall serve as district goals for a given school year shall be computed as late as possible in the previous school year but in any event before the initiation of the Student Assignment Process. The racial/ethnic percentages of a district shall be computed by determining the numbers of public school students residing in a district in grades 1 to 5, 6 to 8 and 9 to 13.

II. Assignments to Citywide Schools

A. It shall be the goal of the school department to assign students to a school in a citywide district so that the school shall reflect the citywide percentages of black, white and other minority students of the appropriate grade level (i.e., grades 1 to 5, 6 to 8, 9 to 13).

B. The permissible percentage variation for racial groups in a school of the citywide district shall continue to be as described in the Court Order of May 10, 1975.

C. Kindergartens in the elementary schools of the citywide district shall reflect the percentages of black, white and other minority students in grades 1 to 5 across the school system.

D. The racial/ethnic percentages which shall serve as citywide goals for a given school year shall be computed simultaneously with the percentages for the community districts. The racial/ethnic percentages of the citywide district shall be computed by determining the numbers of public school students residing within the city in grades 1 to 5, 6 to 8 and 9 to 13 except that students residing in District VIII shall not be part of the computation.

E. The desegregation goals of the Examination Schools and the Hernandez School shall continue to be as described in the Court Order of May 10, 1975.

F. The desegregation goals of the McKay School shall be the citywide percentages for grades 1 to 5.

G. The desegregation goals of Umana School of Science and Technology shall be the citywide percentages for grades 9 - 13.

H. Special citywide schools (i.e., the Carter School, McKinley Schools, Tileston School and Boston Business School) shall not be subject to citywide percentages but shall not be racially isolated.

Special Notes: Assignments to Community and Citywide District Schools

1. The School Department must make every effort to adhere to percentage goals as described herein at the time of the annual Student Assignment Process.

2. During the course of the school year new assignments and discharges may cause enrollment aberrations in some schools. The School Department must make every effort to compensate for such variations from a school's racial/ethnic goals by judicious enforcement of transfer procedures, as described in the Procedural Manual of the Student Services Unit of the Department of Implementation, and by any appropriate special desegregative measures.

3. If, when racial/ethnic percentage goals are being computed per Section I. D. and Section II. D. above, the public school residents of a particular racial/ethnic group (i.e., black, white or other minority) at a particular grade level in a district constitute ten percent or less of the residents of that grade level in that district the School Department is not obliged to concern itself with the attainment of racial/ethnic percentage goals for that group at that grade level in that district.

4. Exceptions to the variation limits described in Section I and II above shall continue to be permitted where necessary to allow appropriate bilingual and/or substantially separate special needs assignments.

5. Nothing in these three sections shall prevent a resident of District VIII from applying to or being enrolled in a citywide school. Further, nothing in these three sections shall prevent the School Department from seeking to enhance desegregation in District VIII.

I. Current (1981-82) K to 13 Percentages

Note: Based on all students

District	Black	White	Other
I	30	28	42
II	44	29	27
III	50	44	6
IV	65	32	3
V	63	25	12
VI	36	45	19
VII	40	22	38
VIII	2	92	6
IX	46	35	19

II. Possible (1982-83) K to 13 Percentages

Note: Based on all students

District	Black	White	Other
I	30	26	44
II	45	26	29
III	53	41	6
IV	68	29	3
V	65	21	14
VI	37	43	20
VII	41	20	39
VIII	2	89	9
IX	48	32	20

III. Possible (1982-83) Percentages Based on Grade Levels

Note 1: Based on all students except those in Kindergarten

Note 2: District IX computation is based on Districts I to

District	Level	Black	White	Other
I	E	30	21	49
	M	31	-26	43
	H	32	28	40
II	E	44	22	34
	M	47	-25	28
	H	49	28	23
III	E	62	30	8
	M	54	-38	8
	H	48	47	5
IV	E	71	25	4
	M	70	-27	3
	H	66	31	3
V	E	66	17	17
	M	66	-22	12
	H	67	23	10
VI	E	36	39	25
	M	34	-47	19
	H	41	43	16

District	Level	Black	White	Other
VII	E	42	16	42
	M	42	-19	39
	H	41	23	36
VIII	E	2	87	11
	M	3	-90	7
	H	3	90	7
IX	E	52	23	25
	M	51	-29	20
	H	51	31	18

Postcript: The above computations were derived by analyzing the K to 14 enrollment of the school system on February 19, 1982. If the approach listed within Section III. of this Appendix is authorized the School Department then would develop percentages for 1982-83 based on the enrollment of the school system in late March or early April of 1982.

2. Faculty and Administrative Staff

MONITORING AREA: STAFFING

I. First Objective: To monitor the achievement and maintenance of 20% black teachers, and 20% black administrators in both Category I and Category II.

A. Data Gathering

1. Study and analysis of Boston Public Schools' "Report on the Number of White, Black and other Minority . . . Administrators . . . and Teachers" (3/1683)
2. Meeting with Deputy Superintendent Rosemary Rosen
3. Meeting with Ida White, Manager, Department of Personnel and Labor Relations, and staff.

B. Findings - The Boston Public Schools have achieved and are apparently maintaining the following percentages of black teachers and administrators:

1. Teachers (all): 20.46% black
2. Administrators: Category I: 21.14% black
3. Administrators: Category II: 21.76% black

C. Discussion: The orders of the Court were first stated in terms of hiring personnel; they were later restated in terms of laying off personnel. The Boston Public Schools have in the last year reached the Court-ordered 20% in all categories by the management of lay-offs, and in part the increase in the percentage of black teachers and administrators is a function of the decline in total numbers in each category.

D. Recommendations: None. For the next six months, these percentages will probably be maintained by the mechanisms in place.

II. Second Objective: To monitor the Boston Public Schools' "best efforts" to increase the percentage of other minority teachers.

A. Data Gathering: Same as in I.A, above with the addition of a meeting with Barbara Fields, Senior Office, Equal Opportunity.

B. Findings - There is one recruiter in the Department of Personnel and Labor Relations; additional recruiting is done, if necessary by Ida White and other members of her staff. Assistance is also given by Barbara Fields. This effort seems adequate to the need since there are very few positions to be filled: the essential activity under this objective (as under the first) is the management of lay-offs. The percentage of other minority teachers on the March 16, 1983 report is 8.25, an increase of one percent from the previous school year.

C. Discussion: It should be noted for the record that the substantial increases in the state's certification requirements make the hiring of other minorities more difficult than in previous years, especially if the candidates are from out of state and seeking certification for counselling or administrative positions.

Further, no mention is made in this report of complaints filed by counsel for the Boston Teachers Union and by counsel for El Comite, since these complaints are now being handled through the dispute resolution process.

D. Recommendations: None

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

March 15, 1983

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Robert R. Spillane, Superintendent

FROM: Ida White, Manager, Personnel/Labor Relations

SUBJECT: March 15, 1983 Report to the United States District Court on Administrators

Please find enclosed the number of white, black and other minority permanent and acting administrators as required to be filed on March 15, 1983 by Order of the United States District Court.

In the January 15, 1983 filing we advised the Court and parties of the December 15, 1982 Managerial Plan and stated that the duties and responsibilities of those positions in question would be reviewed prior to the March 15, 1983 filing. This analysis of the December 14, 1982 Managerial Plan has been completed and, where applicable, those positions have been listed in this report.

mlh

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

1	Superintendent	W
1	Executive Administrative Assistant	W
1	Senior Administrative Assistant	B
1	Media Assistant	W
1	Special Assistant	B

OFFICE OF DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT - FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

1	Deputy Superintendent	W
1	Administrative Assistant	Vacancy
1	Executive Administrative Assistant	W(A)
1	Senior Administrative Assistant	Vacancy
1	Project Director	W(A)
1	Program Director	W(A)

Office of the Business Manager

1	Business Manager	W
2	Assistant Business Managers	W(A)
3	Coordinators	2W(A), 1B(A)

Department of Information Systems Development

1	Manager of Information Systems	O(A)
1	Assistant Manager of Computer Operations	W
4	Project Leaders	W(A)
1	Unit Leader	W(A)
1	Analyst	W(A)

Department of Personnel and Labor Relations

1	Manager	B
1	Assistant Manager	B(A)
1	Assistant Director - Title I	B(A)
1	Assistant Director	W
1	Specialist	B(A)
3	Unit Leaders	2W(A); 1 O(A)
1	Analyst	1 O(A) -
4	Junior Analysts	2W(1A); 1B(A); 1 O(A)
3	Senior Coordinators	2W(A); 1B (A)
1	Personnel Relations Coordinator	W
1	Senior Analyst	B(A)

Office of Budget Management

1	Budget Chief	W
1	Senior External Funds Coordinator	W(A)
1	External Funds Coordinator	W(A)
2	Senior Coordinators	1W; 1B(A)
2	Coordinators	1W; 1B
1	Analyst	W(A)
1	Junior Analyst	B(A)
2	Evaluation Specialists	1W(A); 1B(A)
1	Junior Specialist	B(A)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT - SCHOOL OPERATIONS

1	Deputy Superintendent	B
1	Executive Assistant	B(A)
1	Administrative Assistant	W(A)
1	Program Director	B
1	Project Director	W(A)
1	Coordinator	W(A)

Office of Plant Engineer

1	Chief Engineer	W
1	Deputy Chief Plant Engineer	W
1	Supervisor	B(A)

Department of Food Services

1	Director	W
1	Assistant Director	W
1	Project Director	B

Office of Planning and Engineering

1	Chief Structural Engineer	W(A)
1	Senior Structural Engineer	W
1	Assistant Manager	W(A)
1	Senior Engineer	W(A)

School Safety Services

1	Safety Chief	W(A)
1	Administrative Assistant	W(A)
3	Senior Safety Coordinators	1W; 2B(A)
2	Investigative Counselors	1W; 1B

OFFICE OF DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1	Deputy Superintendent	B
1	Executive Administrative Assistant	W
1	Senior Administrative Assistant	B
1	Director - Title I	W
1	Associate Director - Title I	W
1	Assistant Director - Title I	W
1	Project Director - Title VII	W(A)
1	Specialist - Title VII	W(A)
1	Senior Specialist/Curriculum Writer	B(A)
1	Program Director/Curriculum Objectives	W(A)
1	Senior Advisor - Physical Education	Vacancy
1	Coordinator - Swimming	W(A)
1	Assistant Program Director - Physical Ed.	W

Boston Institute for Professional Development

1	Manager	B(A)
1	Senior Coordinator	W
2	Coordinators	1W; 1B(A)

Office of Instructional Services

1	Manager of Instructional Services	Vacancy
1	Manager - Evaluation and Testing	W(A)
1	Administrative Assistant	B(A)
2	Senior Curriculum Advisors	1B; 1W(A)
1	Associate Director - Title I	W(A)
8	Assistant Directors - Title I	7W, 3(A); 1B(A)
1	Evaluation Specialist	W(A)
1	Assistant Director	W
1	Senior Specialist/Curriculum Writer	W(A)
1	Advanced Work Class Coordinator	W(A)
1	Systems Specialist	W(A)
1	Senior Advisor - Fine Arts	W(A)
1	Senior Advisor - Music	W
1	Senior Advisor - Science	W
1	Program Director - Music	W(A)
1	Senior Program Director - Reading	Vacancy
1	Senior Program Director - Mathematics	Vacancy
1	Senior Program Director - Social Studies	Vacancy
1	Senior Program Director - Foreign Languages	Vacancy
1	Program Director - Athletics	Vacancy
1	Senior Program Director - Technology & Media	Vacancy

Bilingual

1	Senior Advisor	W
6	Coordinators of Bil. & Multicultural Education Resources	3W; 2 O(1A); 1B
1	Administrative Assistant	O(A)

Bilingual Lau Unit

1	Coordinator	W
2	Specialists	1B(A); 1W(A)

Student Support Services

1	Manager	W(A)
1	Staff Assistant	W(A)
1	Projects Director	B(A)
1	Teacher-in-Charge	W(A)
1	Projects Director - Bilingual Special Ed.	O(A)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION

Early Childhood/Elementary Student Support Programs

1	Senior Advisor	W(A)
1	Special Assistant	B(A)

Middle School Student Support Programs

1	Senior Advisor	W
1	Special Assistant	W(A)

Secondary School Student Support Programs

1	Senior Advisor	W(A)
1	Special Assistant	B(A)

Pupil Services

2	Senior Advisors	W
1	Senior Coordinator	W(A)

Compliance/Placement

1	Assistant Manager	W(A)
1	Special Assistant	W(A)

Contracted Services

1	Associate Manager	W

Adult Educational and Recreational Activities

1	Director	W(A)
1	Coordinating Supervisor	W(A)

*Department of Educational & Employment Services

2	Transitional Associates	W(A)
1	Transitional Assistant	W(A)
2	Assistant Directors	1B; 1W
1	Coordinator of Urban Retrofit Programs	W(A)

OFFICE OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

1	Senior Officer	B(A)
1	Senior Administrative Assistant	B(A)
1	Personnel Specialist	Vacancy

OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL

1	General Counsel	W
2	Assistant General Counsels	W
1	Assistant General Counsel-Labor Relations	B

*Reports to Director of Educational and Employment at HHHORC

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF SENIOR OFFICER - IMPLEMENTATION

1	Senior Officer	W
1	Staff Assistant	W(A)

DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION

1	Executive Director	B
4	Directors	3W(2A); 1B(A)
1	Assistant Director	W(A)
1	Coordinator	B(A)
11	Specialists	3B(1A); 5W(3A) 2 O(1A);1vac
13	Officers	6B(3A); 5W(3A); 1 O(A); 1 vacancy
2	Analysts	2W(A)

TOTAL NUMBER OF PERMANENT AND ACTING ADMINISTRATORS - CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION

	PERMANENT			ACTING			VACANCIES	TOTALS
	B	W	O	B	W	O		
perintendent		1						1
puty perintendents	2	1						3
enior Officers		1		1				2
xecutive dmin.Assistant		2		1	1			4
enior/Admin. ssistant	2			2	2	1	2	9
edia/Special ssistant	1	1		2	2			6
xecutive irector	1							1
irectors		3		1	3			7
enior Advisors		6			3		1	10
ssociate irectors		1			1			2
ssistant irectors	1	10		2	4			17
roject/Program irectors	2			1	6	1	6	16
taff ssistants					2			2
enior/Junior oordinators	2	10	1	7	11	1		32
upervisors				1	1			2
enior/Junior pecialists	2	2	1	5	6	1	1	18
fficers	3	2		3	3	1	1	13
ounselor	1	1						2
anagers	1	1		1	2	1	1	7
Asst./Associate anagers		2		1	4			7
Senior/Junior Analysts		1		3	5	2		11
Project/Unit Leaders					7	1		8
Budget/Security Chief		1			1			2
Evaluation/ Systems Spec.				1	3			4
Chief Engineer		1			1			2

TOTAL NUMBER OF PERMANENT AND ACTING ADMINISTRATORS - CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION

	PERMANENT			ACTING			VACANCIES	TOTALS
	B	W	O	B	W	O		
puty/Senior gineer		2			1			3
nior. rriculum Advis.	1				1			2
acher-In- arge					1			1
ansitional ssociates					2			2
ansitional ssistant					1			1
en./Asst. unsel	1	3						4
TOTALS	20	52	2	32	74	9	12	201

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION

*PROGRAM SPECIALISTS - STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

	15 12W; 3B

*PERSONNEL ON ASSIGNMENT

Library	3 2W; 1B
Bilingual Department	2 1W; 1 O (636 funded)
Personnel	1W (Director on Assignment)
Vocational/Occupational Education	1B
Student Support Services	2W (1 funded)
Office of Deputy Superintendent/ Finance and Administration	1W (Headmaster on Assignment)
Audio Visual Department	1W (Headmaster on Assignment)
Office of Implementation	1W (Headmaster on Assignment)
TOTAL	27 21W; 5B; 1 O

*Not included in any previous totals.

OFFICES OF THE COMMUNITY SUPERINTENDENTS

Community District One

1	Community Superintendent	W(A)
1	Administrative Assistant	W(A)
1	Guidance Counselor	O(A)

Community District Two

1	Community Superintendent	W
1	Administrative Assistant	W(A)

Community District Three

1	Community Superintendent	W(A)
1	Administrative Assistant	W(A)

Community District Four

1	Community Superintendent	B
1	Administrative Assistant	B

Community District Five

1	Community Superintendent	B
1	Administrative Assistant	B
1	Administrative Assistant for 636 Projects	B(A)

Community District Six

1	Community Superintendent	W
1	Administrative Assistant	W

Community District Seven

1	Community Superintendent	W
1	Administrative Assistant	W

Community District Eight

1	Community Superintendent	W
1	Administrative Assistant	W

Community District Nine

1	Community Superintendent	B
2	Administrative Assistants	1W(A); 1B(A)

TOTAL NUMBER OF PERMANENT AND ACTING ADMINISTRATORS

OFFICES OF THE COMMUNITY SUPERINTENDENTS

	PERMANENT			ACTING			VACANCIES	TOTAL
	B	W	O	B	W	O		
ommunity Superintendents	3	4	0	0	2	0		9
dministrative Assistants	2	3	0	2	4	0		11
uidance Counselors	0	0	0	0	0	1		1
TOTALS	5	7	0	2	6	1		21

OFFICES OF THE COMMUNITY SUPERINTENDENTS

School Psychologists and Pupil Adjustment Counselors*

	Permanent			Acting			Total		
	B	W	O	B	W	O	B	W	O
School Psychologists	7	30	2	1	1	1	8	31	3
Pupil Adjustment Counselors	0	16	0	1	0	3	1	16	3

Personnel on Assignment*

Community District One	2 1W; 1B (Liaison Teacher - Funded)
Community District Two	3 1W; 2B (1 Liaison Teacher - Funded; 1 teacher - 636 Funded)
Community District Three	2W (Includes 1 Liaison Teacher-Funded)
Community District Four	2W (Includes 1 Liaison Teacher-Funded)
Community District Five	6W (Includes 1 Liaison Teacher-Funded; 4 Teachers - 636 Funded); 1B
Community District Six	3W (Includes 1 Liaison Teacher-Funded; also 1 Funded by 636)
Community District Seven	2W (Includes 1 Liaison Teacher-Funded)
Community District Eight	2W (Includes 1 Liaison Teacher-Funded)
Community District Nine	1B
TOTAL	23 18W; 5B

*Not included in any previous totals.

ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS - HIGH SCHOO

IGH SCHOOL	HEAD MASTER				ASSISTANT HEAD MASTER				ASSISTANT H.M. SUBJECT				GUIDANCE				DIVISION HEAD				COORDINATO DIRECTOR		
DISTRICT I	B	W	O	T	B	W	O	T	B	W	O	T	B	W	O	T	B	W	O	T	B	W	O
righton High	1A			1A		2A 1		2A 1		8		8	1A	2	1	1A 3				0		1A	
DISTRICT II																							
maica Plain	1			1		2A 1		2A 1	1	3A 4		3A 5	1A 1	1A		2A 1				0			
DISTRICT III																							
st Roxbury		1		1					1	6		7	1	2		3				0		1A	
DISTRICT IV																							
de Park High		1		1	1A	2		1A 2	1	2A 4		2A 5		3		3				0		1A	
DISTRICT V																							
urke, J. E.	1A			1A	2A			2A	1A 1	2A 3		3A 4		2A		2A				0			
orchester		1A		1A	1A	1		1A 1	1A 1	5		1A 6	1	1		2				0		1A	
DISTRICT VI																							
uth Boston		1		1		1A		1A	2A 1	4A 2	1A	7A 3	2	2		4				0		1A	
ISTRICT VII																							
harlestown		1		1	1			1	1A	4	1A	2A 4		1A 1	2	1A 3				0			
ISTRICT VIII																							
ast Boston		1A		1A		1A		1A	1	7		8	1	3		4				0		1	

ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS - HIGH SCHOOLS

IGH SCHOOL	HEAD MASTER				ASSISTANT HEAD MASTER				ASSISTANT H.M. SUBJECT				GUIDANCE				DIVISION HEAD				COORDINATOR DIRECTOR		
	B	W	O	T	B	W	O	T	B	W	O	T	B	W	O	T	B	W	O	T	B	W	O
DISTRICT IX																							
oston Business		1		1				0	1	1		2				0				0			
oston High	1			1				0	2A	5		2A* 5*				0				0			
oston Latin		1		1		1A 1		1A 1	1	1A 10		1A 11	1A	4		1A 4				0			
atin Academy		1		1		2		2	1	1A 4		1A 5	1	2		3				0			
oston Tech		1		1	2A	1A		3A	1A 1	3A 3	1	4A 5	1	1A 1		1A 2				0			
pley Square		1		1		1		1	1	3		4		1A 1		1A 1				0			
glish High		1A		1A	1	2A		2A 1	1	2A 6	1	2A 8	1	1A 3	1	1A 5				0			
adison Pk.		1		1	1	1		2	2	2A 6		2A 8	1	2A 2	1	2A 4				0			
ario Umana	1			1		1		1	2	1A 2		1A 4	1	2		3				0			
TOTALS																							
ermanent	3	10	0	13	3	11	0	14	17	83	2	102	11	29	5	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Acting	2	3	0	5	6	10	0	16	8	21	2	31	3	9	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
GRAND TOTALS	5	13	0	18	9	21	0	30	25	104	4	133	14	38	5	57	0	0	0	0	0	6	0

*Job Supervisors

ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS - MIDDLE SCHOOL

MIDDLE SCHOOLS	PRINCIPAL				ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL			
	B	W	O	T	B	W	O	T
DISTRICT I								
Edison		1		1		1		1
Taft			1	1		1		1
DISTRICT II								
Curley, Mary E.	1A			1A		2		2
Lewis	1			1		1		1
Roosevelt		1		1		1		1
DISTRICT III								
Irving		1		1		2		2
Lewenberg	1			1		1		1
Shaw, R. G.		1		1		1		1
DISTRICT V								
Rogers		1		1		1		1
Thompson	1			1		1		1
DISTRICT V								
Cleveland		1		1		3		3
Holmes		1		1		1		1
Wilson	1			1	1A	2		1A 2
DISTRICT VI								
Dearborn		1		1		1		1
Gavin		1		1		1		1
McCormack	1A			1A		2		2

ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS - MIDDLE SCHOOL

MIDDLE SCHOOLS	PRINCIPAL				ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL			
	B	W	O	T	B	W	O	T
DISTRICT VII								
Edwards		1		1	1(A)			1(A)
Michaelangelo		1		1		1		1
Timilty	1			1		1		1
DISTRICT VIII								
Barnes		1		1		2		2
Cheverus		1		1				
DISTRICT IX								
King, Martin L.	1			1		2		2
Mackey, Charles	1			1		1		1
Wheatley, Phyllis	1			1		1		1
TOTALS:								
Permanent	8	13	1	22	0	30	0	30
Acting	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	2
GRAND TOTALS	10	13	1	24	2	30	0	32

ADMINISTRATORS - SPECIAL SCHOOLS AND PROGRAMS

TEACHER-IN-CHARGE

1	Dorchester High School	W (A)
1	Carter School	W (A)

WORK EXPERIENCE COORDINATOR

1	South Boston High School	W (A)

PROGRAM DIRECTOR

1	McKinley School	W (A)

PROJECT ADMINISTRATOR

1	Tileston School	W (A)

ASSISTANT PROJECT ADMINISTRATOR

1	Tileston School	W (A)

ANOTHER COURSE TO COLLEGE

1	Headmaster	W

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

1	Brighton High School	B (A)
1	English High School	W (A)

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY OCCUPATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER

1	Director	W
1	Headmaster	B(A)
2	Assistant Headmasters	1W; 1B
1	Area Coordinator	W(A)
1	Senior Administrative Assistant	B
8	Cluster Administrators	7W (1A); 1B
1	Business Agent	W (A)
1	Bilingual Coordinator	B
1	Special Needs Coordinator	W
1	Program Director/Occ. Instr. Design	W (A)
1	Specialist/Occ. Grants Manager	W (A)
1	System Support Specialist	W (A)

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

DISTRICT I

	PRINCIPALS					ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS				
	B	W	O	TOTAL		B	W	O	TOTAL	
Baldwin	1			1						
Farragut		1		1						
Gardner		1		1						
Garfield		1		1						
Hamilton		1		1						
Tobin		1		1			1		1	
Winship		1		1						
TOTALS	1	6		7			1		1	

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

DISTRICT II

	PRINCIPALS					ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS				
	B	W	O	TOTAL		B	W	O	TOTAL	
Agassiz		1		1			1		1	
Ellis	1			1						
Fuller		1		1						
Higginson		1		1						
Kennedy, John		1		1						
Longfellow		1		1						
Manning		1		1						
Mendell		1		1						
Parkman	1	0		1						
TOTALS	2	7		9			1		1	

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

DISTRICT III

	PRINCIPALS					ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS				
	B	W	O	TOTAL		B	W	O	TOTAL	
Bates	1			1						
Beethoven		1		1						
Kilmer		1		1						
Lee		1		1			1		1	
Lyndon		1		1						
Mattahunt		1		1			2		2	
Mozart		1		1						
Philbrick		1		1						
Sumner		1		1			1		1	
TOTALS	1	8		9			4		4	

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

DISTRICT IV

	PRINCIPALS					ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS				
	B	W	O	TOTAL		B	W	O	TOTAL	
Channing		1		1						
Chittick		1		1						
Conley		1		1						
Greenwood, E.		1		1						
Grew	1			1						
Hemenway		1		1						
Roosevelt, F.		1		1						
Shaw. P.A.		1		1						
Taylor		1		1			1		1	
TOTALS	1	8		9			1		1	

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

DISTRICT V

	PRINCIPALS					ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS				
	B	W	O	TOTAL		B	W	O	TOTAL	
Dickerman		1		1						
Endicott		1		1						
Everett		1		1						
Fifield		1		1						
Greenwood, S.		1		1			1		1	
Holland		1		1			2		2	
Kenny		1		1						
Marshall		1		1			2		2	
Mather		1		1			1		1	
Murphy		1		1			2		2	
O'Hearn		1		1						
Stone	1			1						
TOTALS	1	11		12			8		8	

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

DISTRICT VI

	PRINCIPALS					ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS				
	B	W	O	TOTAL		B	W	O	TOTAL	
Clap		1		1						
Condon		1		1			2		2	
Dever		1		1			1		1	
Emerson	1			1						
Mason		1		1						
Perkins		1		1						
Perry		1		1						
Russell		1		1						
Tynan		1		1						
Winthrop		1		1						
TOTALS	1	9		10			3		3	

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

DISTRICT VII

	PRINCIPALS					ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS				
	B	W	O	TOTAL		B	W	O	TOTAL	
Blackstone		1		1			2		2	
Eliot		1A		1A						
Hurley		1		1						
Harvard-Kent		1		1			1		1	
Quincy		1		1			1		1	
Warren-Prescott		1		1						
TOTALS		6(1A)		6 (1A)			4		4	

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

DISTRICT VIII

	PRINCIPALS					ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS				
	B	W	O	TOTAL		B	W	O	TOTAL	
Adams	1			1						
Alighieri		1		1						
Bradley		1		1						
Kennedy P.		1		1						
O'Donnell		1		1						
Otis		1		1						
TOTALS	1	5		6		0	0	0	0	

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

DISTRICT IX

	PRINCIPALS					ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS				
	B	W	O	TOTAL		B	W	O	TOTAL	
Curley., J.		1		1						
Guild		1		1						
Hale		1		1						
Haley		1		1						
Hennigan		1		1			1		1	
Hernandez. R.			1(A)	1(A)						
Jackson-Mann		1		1			2		2	
McKay	1			1			1		1	
Ohrenberger		1		1			1		1	
Trotter	1			1			2		2	
Mann Unit		1		1						
TOTALS	2	8	1(A)	11(1A)			7		7	

TOTAL NUMBER OF PERMANENT AND ACTING ADMINISTRATORS

SCHOOL FACILITIES

	PERMANENT			ACTING			TOTAL
	B	W	O	B	W	O	
eadmasters	3	11	0	3	3	0	20
ssistant Headmasters	4	12	0	6	10	0	32
ssistant Headmasters-Subject	17	83	2	8	21	2	133
uidance Counselors	11	29	5	3	9	0	57
oordinators-Directors	0	1	0	0	5	0	6
luster Administrators	1	6	0	0	1	0	8
usiness Agent	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
rincipals	18	80	1	2	1	1	103
ssistant Principals	0	59	0	2	0	0	61
eachers-In-Charge	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
enior Administrative Assistant/ dministrative Assistant	1	0	0	1	1	0	3
ork Experience Coordinator	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
rogram Directors	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
roject Administrator/ ssistant Project Administator	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
irector	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
oordinators	1	1	0	0	1	0	3
pecialist	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
TOTALS	56	283	8	25	62	3	437

Includes seven(7) Job Supervisors at Boston High School

TOTAL ADMINISTRATORS, RESEARCH ASSISTANTS, PUPIL ADJUSTMENT COUNSELORS AND PERSONNEL ON ASSIGNMENT

(Includes Vacancies)

Central Administrators	(Pages 1-7)	201
Research Assistants, Pupil Adjustment Counselors Personnel on Assignment (Pages 8 and 11)		112
Community Superintendents' Offices (Pages 9 and 10)		21
School Administrators (pages 12 to 26)		437
	TOTAL:	771

	B	W	O	T		B%	W%	O%
eadmaster/Principal	26	95	2	123		21.14	77.23	1.63

CATEGORY II

	NUMBER					PERCENT		
	B	W	O	T		B%	W%	O%
entral Administration	52	126	11	189		27.51	66.67	5.82
ommunity District Super-intendents' Offices	7	13	1	21		33.33	61.91	4.76
chool Facilities	55	250	9	314		17.52	79.61	2.87
OTAL	114	389	21	524		21.76	74.23	4.01

CATEGORY II - By Title

	NUMBER					PERCENT		
	B	W	O	T		B%	W%	O%
uperintendent	0	1	0	1		0	100	0
eputy Superintendent	2	1	0	3		66.67	33.33	0
enior Officer	1	1	0	2		50.00	50.00	0
ecutive / Executive ssistant Administrative	1	3	0	4		25.00	75.00	0
enior/ ministrative Assistant	10	10	1	21		47.62	47.62	4.76
ecutive Director	1	0	0	1		100	0	0
ia/Special Assistant	3	3	0	6		50.00	50.00	0
irector	1	7	0	8		12.50	87.50	0
enior Advisor	0	9	0	9		0	100.00	0
sociate Director	0	2	0	2		0	100.00	0
sistant Director	3	14	0	17		17.65	82.35	0
ogram/ roject Director	3	8	1	12		25.00	66.67	8.33
oject/Unit Leader	0	7	1	8		0	87.50	12.50
taff Assistant	0	2	0	2		0	100.00	0
ief Engineer	0	2	0	2		0	100.00	0
puty/Senior Engineer	0	3	0	3		0	100.00	0

CATEGORY II - By Title (Cont'd)

	NUMBER					PERCENT		
TITLE	**B**	**W**	**O**	**T**		**B%**	**W%**	**O%**
neral Counsel/Asst. Counsel	1	3	0	4		25.00	75.00	
nior/Junior Coordinator	10	24	2	36		27.78	66.66	5.56
pervisor	1	1	0	2		50.00	50.00	0
dget/Security Chief	0	2	0	2		0	100.00	0
nior/Junior Specialist	7	10	2	19		36.84	52.63	10.53
ansition Assoc./Assistant	0	3	0	3		0	100.00	0
eacher-in-Charge	0	3	0	3		0	100.00	0
fficer	6	5	1	12		50.00	41.67	8.33
ounselor (Safety)	1	1	0	2		50.00	50.00	0
anager	2	3	1	6		33.33	50.00	16.67
enior Curriculum Advisor	1	1	0	2		50.00	50.00	0
ssistant/Associate Manager	1	6	0	7		14.29	85.71	0
aluation/Systems Specialist	1	3	0	4		25.00	75.00	0
nior/Junior Analyst	3	6	2	11		27.27	54.55	18.18
oject/Assistant Project dministrator	0	2	0	2		0	100.00	0
unity Superintendent	3	6	0	9		33.33	66.67	0
ssistant Principal	2	59	0	61		3.28	96.72	0
ssistant Headmaster	10	22	0	32		31.25	68.75	0
ssistant Headmaster-Subject	25	104	4	133		18.80	78.19	3.01
uidance Counselor -	14	38	6	58		24.14	65.52	10.34
oordinator-Director	0	6	0	6		0	100.00	0
luster Administrator	1	7	0	8		12.50	87.50	0
siness Agent	0	1	0	1		0	100.00	0
TOTALS	114	389	21	524		21.76	74.23	4.01

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTO

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL/LABOR RELATIONS
MANAGER
IDA WHITE

March 15, 1983

Dr. Robert R. Spillane, Superintendent of Schools
Boston Public Schools
26 Court Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Dear Dr. Spillane:

The United States District Court in its Order on Faculty Recruiting and Hiring, issued on January 28, 1975, required the defendants on or before March 15 of each year to file with the Court and all parties a ranking system by which they propose to rank all black applicants for teaching positions, together with a report on the numbers of black and white permanent and provisional teachers then employed at each level.

In its July 5, 1978 Memorandum and Further Orders on Faculty Recruiting and Hiring the United States District Court also ordered that the reports due March 15 and October 15 shall include tables showing:

i. The number and percentages of white, black and other minority teachers in regular, special and bilingual education for the current year and the previous three (3) years;

ii. The number of black, white and other minority first, second and third year provisionals currently employed and provisionals hired for a fourth year;

iii. The number of newly hired provisional teachers for the current year and the previous three (3) years subdivided by subject areas to which assigned;

iv. The number of newly appointed provisional teachers for the current year and the previous three (3) years subdivided by subject areas to which assigned.

Enclosed herewith for your processing is the information required by the Court for March 15, 1983.

Very truly yours,

Ida White, Manager
Personnel/Labor Relations

Enclosure
IW/mlh

26 COURT STREET BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108

TEACHING STAFF - MARCH 15, 1983

HIGH SCHOOLS

	BLACK	WHITE	OTHER MINORITY	TOTAL
REGULAR TEACHERS				
Permanent	140	758	23	921
Provisional	21	5	0	26
Temporary	2	4	0	6
Sub-total	163	767	23	953
VOCATIONAL TEACHERS				
Permanent	13	90	7	110
Provisional	19	7	8	34
Temporary	0	2	0	2
Sub-total	32	99	15	146
BILINGUAL TEACHERS				
Permanent	11	32	27	70
Provisional	9	1	21	31
Temporary	1	0	1	2
Sub-total	21	33	49	103
SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS				
Permanent	32	129	9	170
Provisional	5	2	1	8
Temporary	1	2	0	3
Sub-total	38	133	10	181
GRAND TOTAL	254	1032	97	1383

TEACHING STAFF - MARCH 15, 1983

MIDDLE SCHOOLS

	BLACK	WHITE	OTHER MINORITY	TOTAL
REGULAR TEACHERS				
Permanent	172	473	9	654
Provisional	17	0	3	20
Temporary	0	0	0	0
Sub-total	189	473	12	674
VOCATIONAL TEACHERS				
Permanent	0	0	0	0
Provisional	0	0	0	0
Temporary	0	0	0	0
Sub-total	0	0	0	0
BILINGUAL TEACHERS				
Permanent	9	15	33	57
Provisional	3	2	13	18
Temporary	0	0	0	0
Sub-total	12	17	46	75
SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS				
Permanent	44	113	5	162
Provisional	8	2	6	16
Temporary	0	3	0	3
Sub-total	52	118	11	181
GRAND TOTAL	253	608	69	930

TEACHING STAFF - MARCH 15, 1983

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

	BLACK	WHITE	OTHER MINORITY	TOTAL
REGULAR TEACHERS				
Permanent	186	727	10	923
Provisional	25	1	2	28
Temporary	1	0	0	1
Sub-total	212	728	12	952
VOCATIONAL TEACHERS				
Permanent	0	0	0	0
Provisional	0	0	0	0
Temporary	0	0	0	0
Sub-total	0	0	0	0
BILINGUAL TEACHERS				
Permanent	15	66	79	160
Provisional	11	1	46	58
Temporary	2	3	5	10
Sub-total	28	70	130	228
SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS				
Permanent	42	233	15	290
Provisional	10	8	5	23
Temporary	2	0	0	2
Sub-total	54	241	20	315
GRAND TOTAL	294	1039	162	1495

234

TEACHING STAFF - MARCH 15, 1983

SPECIAL SCHOOLS AND PROGRAMS

	BLACK	WHITE	OTHER MINORITY	TOTAL
PERMANENT	13	97	4	114
PROVISIONAL	5	14	2	21
TEMPORARY	1	1	0	2
Sub-total	19	112	6	137
GRAND TOTAL	19	112	6	137

ITINERANT TEACHERS

	BLACK	WHITE	OTHER MINORITY	TOTAL
PERMANENT	14	119	3	136
PROVISIONAL	4	10	1	15
TEMPORARY	0	0	0	0
Sub-total	18	129	4	151
GRAND TOTAL	18	129	4	151

1. NUMBER AND PERCENT OF WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER MINIORITY TEACHERS IN REGULAR, VOCATIONAL, SPECIAL, AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION

YEAR	REGULAR EDUCATION**				VOCATIONAL EDUCATION				SPECIAL EDUCATION**				BILINGUAL EDUCATION				TOTAL TEACHERS			
	Total Teachers	White Teachers	Black Teachers	Other Teachers	Total Teachers	White Teachers	Black Teachers	Other Teachers	Total Teachers	White Teachers	Black Teachers	Other Teachers	Total Teachers	White Teachers	Black Teachers	Other Teachers	Total Teachers	White Teachers	Black Teachers	Other
79-1980	3850	3081	685	84					1038	738	255	45	319	114	27	178	5207	3933	967	307
rcentages	100	80.03	17.80	2.18					100	71.10	24.57	4.34	100	35.74	8.46	55.80	100	75.53	18.57	5.9
80-1981	3531	2831	626	74	180	122	37	21	1067	722	279	66	372	124	41	207	5150	3799	983	36
rcentages	100	80.18	17.72	2.10	100	67.78	20.55	11.67	100	67.66	26.15	6.19	100	33.33	11.02	55.65	100	73.76	19.10	7.
81-1982	2885	2282	566	37	160	113	33	14	927	643	219	65	364	132	36	196	4336	3170	854	3
rcentages	100	79.10	19.62	1.28	100	70.62	20.63	8.75	100	69.36	23.63	7.01	100	36.26	9.89	53.85	100	73.11	19.70	7.
82-1983	2636	2021	568	47	146	99	32	15	908	680	177	51	406	120	61	225	4096	2920	838	33
rcentages	100	76.67	21.55	1.78	100	67.81	21.92	10.27	100	74.89	19.49	5.62	100	29.56	15.02	55.42	100	71.29	20.46	8.

** Includes those who were listed under "Special Schools" and "Itinerant Teachers."

ii. NUMBER OF WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER MINORITY FIRST, SECOND, THIRD, AND FOURTH YEAR (PERMANENT) PROVISIONALS

YEAR	BLACK	WHITE	OTHER MINORITY	TOTAL
FIRST	71	25	58	154
SECOND	18	11	23	52
THIRD	48	14	27	89
FOURTH (PERMANENT)	79	16	46	141
TOTAL	216	66	154	436

iii NEW PROVISIONAL HIRES BY YEAR 1979-80 - 1982-83

	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	TOTAL	PERCENT BY AREA
ELEMENTARY						
B	22	3	½	22	47½	90.48
W	2	0	0	1	3	5.71
O	1	0	0	1	2	3.81
T	25	3	½	24	52½	
SECONDARY						
B	57	23	2	11	93	82.30
W	5	2	0	2	9	7.97
O	7	2	0	2	11	9.73
T	69	27	2	15	113	
ART						
B	6	0	0	2	8	100.00
W	0	0	0	0	0	0
O	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	6	0	0	2	8	
HOME ECONOMICS						
B	5	5	0	0	10	90.91
W	1	0	0	0	1	9.09
O	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	6	5	0	0	11	
INDUSTRIAL ARTS						
B	9	0	0	1	10	58.82
W	1	0	0	0	1	5.89
O	6	0	0	0	6	35.29
T	16	0	0	1	17	
VOC. ED.						
B		10	1	4	15	88.24
W		0	0	0	0	0
O		1	0	1	2	11.76
T		11	1	5	17	

NEW HIRES (Cont)

	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	TOTAL	
MUSIC						
B	3	2	0	0	5	
W	0	0	0	0	0	
O	0	0	0	0	0	
T	3	2	0	0	5	
PHYSICAL ED.						
B	3	3	2	3	11	
W	0	0	0	0	0	
O	2	1	0	0	3	
T	5	4	2	3	14	
HHORC						
B	1	8	0	5	14	.
W	0	10	0	2	12	3
O	1	7	1	2	11	2
T	2	25	1	9	37	
FUNDED						
B	12	7	5	*	24	53.
W	9	5	1		15	33..
O	3	3	0		6	13.3
T	24	15	6		45	
ADULT ED.						
B	0	0	0	0	0	0
W	0	0	0	0	0	0
O	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	0	
ENGLISH LANGUAGE CTR. Closed						
B	0	0	0	0	0	0
W	1	1	0	0	2	100.00
O	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	1	1	0	0	2	

* included in subject/grad-

NEW HIRES (Cont.)

	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	TOTAL	PERCENT BY AREA
BILINGUAL						
B	5	12	2	15	34	15.28
W	13	2	1	2	18	8.09
O	54	46	21½	49	170½	76.63
T	72	60	24½	66	222½	
SPECIAL ED						
B	51	43	2	8	104	45.42
W	39	14	13	18	84	36.68
O	18	12	8	3	41	17.90
T	108	69	23	29	229	
GRAND TOTALS						
B	174	116	14½	71	375½	48.58
W	71	34	15	25	145	18.75
O	92	72	30½	58	252½	32.67
T	337	222	60	154	773	

iv. NEWLY APPOINTED PERMANENT BLACK, WHITE, AND OTHER MINIORITY TEACHERS

1979-1980 thru 1982-1983

	1979-1980	1980-1981	1981-1982	1982-1983	TOTAL	PERCENT BY AREA
SECONDARY						
B	1	0	0	0	1	25
W	3	0	0	0	3	75
O	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	4	0	0	0	4	
ART						
B	0	0	0	0	0	0
W	0	0	0	0	0	0
O	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	0	
FUNDED						
B	0	0	0	0	0	0
W	0	0	0	0	0	0
O	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	0	
GRAND TOTALS						
B	1	0	0	0	1	25
W	3	0	0	0	3	75
O	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	4	0	0	0	4	

3. Special Desegregation Measures

Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

May 17, 1983

Special Desegregation Monitoring: Note on Methodology

The Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity had three monitoring objectives with respect to Special Desegregation Measures:

1. To determine whether all measures required by the Court continue to be carried out.
2. To determine the effectiveness of all continuing special desegregation measures. And,
3. To determine compliance with all terms of voluntary special desegregation measures which have not been formalized as Court orders, and with all terms of measures arrived pursuant to the process of dispute resolution.

In order to achieve our monitoring objectives, we implemented the following procedures:

- Reviewed all relevant Court orders and school system memoranda.
- Consulted with Bob Blumenthal and Charles Glenn as to our internal analysis of appropriate documents.
- Arranged for on-site school visits at the Burke, East Boston, Umana and Dorchester High Schools through Lydia Francis of the Department of Implementation, Boston Public Schools.
- Conducted interviews with Headmasters from each High School:

May 3	Umana	Gustave Anglin
May 3	E.B.H.S.	John Poto
May 4	Burke	Albert Holland
May 13	Dorchester	Stanley Schwartz

- Reviewed pertinent student assignment data for the 1982-83 school year and on-going analysis of all student assignment information being carried out by Charles Glenn.

Michael Alves
Judith Taylor

OUTSTANDING SPECIAL DESEGREGATION ORDERS

Order of May 3, 1976

Formulate and implement forthwith special measures for the effective desegregation of four elementary schools which are currently identifiably black schools...and file reports of actions taken.

Ellis	District 2
Lee	District 3
Bradford*	District 4
Hale	District 7

East Boston high shall remain a district 8 high school...to be desegregated in accordance with plans to be formulated by the parties and submitted to the court....

The facility heretofore called new Barnes shall not be a middle school, as provided at p.62 of this plan, but a six-grade technical school for grades 7-12 planned...through the district 9 superintendent.

Order of May 6, 1977

Department of Implementation shall formulate and implement special measures, including, where appropriate, modifications in geocode units and assignments of K1 and K2 students, for the effective desegregation of the schools listed below.

Shaw	District 3
Thompson	District 4
Shaw	District 4
Emerson	District 6
Tuckerman*	District 6

Support and assist administrators, faculty, parents...to strengthen the magnetism...of course offerings and to recruit additional students.

Guild
Hennigan
McKay

Kindergarten assignments shall be made as part of the regular assignment process by...the Department of Implementation.

The business education magnet program will be phased in as follows [at East Boston High School]: for 1977-78 at least 200 seats will be set aside...shall comply strictly with magnet ratios and restrictions for citywide schools and programs.

*School no longer operational.

Order of March 21, 1978

Review the need for additional support services at the examination schools, including guidance and counseling, summer orientation and screening, professional and peer tutoring and remedial education.

Develop additional support services as needed.

File reports...for:

Boston Latin
Latin Academy
Boston Technical High School

(Draft Order of November 6, 1981)

With respect to Burke, the Department of Implementation shall prepare three plans: a curricular program plan, a facility improvement plan, and a plan for staffing which fits the curricular program for Burke High School.

With respect to Dorchester, the D.I. shall conduct an assessment of the curricular[,] physical plant and staffing needs of Dorchester High School for the 1982-83 school year and shall file a report of the results of such study, including recommendations for change.

Bench Order of April 20, 1982

(The Charlestown High School Bilingual Program will maintain a minimum of five staff.)

SPECIAL DESEGREGATION MONITORING

School	Court Order Reference	Monitoring Issue	Findings
Mario Umana Technical H.S.	May 3,1976 pg. 20	Grades 9-12 open a technical school developed through district IV Superintendent with MIT, Wentworth, Massport.	
		1. Degree of sucess in implementing order	A 7-12 technical high school has been established and is operating successfully. The first class was graduated last year. Approximately 1,000 students are enrolled each year, and about 920 complete the school year.
		2. What are the factors that account for the Umana's success?	* The fruitful collaboration with MIT, Wentworth, and Massport * The science/technology curriculum that prepares students for higher education * The absence of racial tension * The school is, with few exceptions, a safe school * The emphasis on discipline * The fact that Umana is not an exam school * The inclusion of the 7th and 8th grades, during which students can be prepared in the academic and technical prerequisites
East Boston High School	May 3, 76 pg. 20	1. East Boston High School shall be desegregated in accordance with plans to be formulated by the parties and submitted to the court.	* A plan for a "business magnet" program at East Boston High school was submitted on Feb. 16, 1977; an amplified plan submitted on June 1, 1977 was accepted by the Court. In May, 1977 the Court ordered that seats be set aside for the business magnet (200in 1977-78, 300 in 1978-79, 400 in 1979-80), and enrollments comply strictly with magnet ratios and restrictions for citywide schools and programs. * Continued on page 2.

SPECIAL DESEGREGATION MONITORING

School	Court Order Reference	Monitoring Issue	Findings
			* The business magnet offers specializations in legal and medical office training, reprographics and computerized accounting. The number of students assigned to the program has not yet exceeded 300, but racial proportions have complied with citywide ratios. At present, magnet students attend core courses, general business courses, and electives with EBHS students, but only they may take the specialized magnet programs.
	Jan 5, 79 pg 1-2	Describe present transfer policy as it applies to magnet minority students who wish to transfer into academic courses at EBHS.	* BPS transfer policy prhibits inter-district transfers; since most minority magnet students reside outside District VIII, they could not apply to regular EBHS programs. District VIII magnet students could apply for transfer to EBHS; their applications would be decided by lottery, and they would be protected by the present school guarantee. At present, magnet students with college aspirations have only one option: using their semester elective to take college prep courses. A constraining factor is that the core business magnet curriculum includes no foreign language or college prep math: only reprographics majors have enough electives to take both language and math courses. It should be noted that EBHS offers a "college business" track. which is not available to the magnet students.
		Describe the success of the EBHS magnet program in attracting and retaining students.	* Prior to this year, EBHS received a special state 636 grant to recruit students to the magnet program, the grant was eliminated this year and so there was no special recruiting. * Recruiting seems to be a futile activity since the number and racial proportions of magnet students are determined by the Department of Implementation and are independent of any recruiting activity. Many students may have been recruited who were never assigned. Magnet staff would never know if they were successful.

SPECIAL DESEGREGATION MONITORING

School	Court Order Reference	Monitoring Issue	Findings
			• No data were available regarding retention rates.
		Describe the role and racial composition of the parent/community advisory group that is supposed to monitor recruiting and retention of the business magnet and also the issues regarding requested transfers of minority magnet students.	• There has not been any monitoring activity of the business magnet for some time. At present there is no community/parent advisory group functioning in District VIII.
Jeremiah E. Burke High School	Nov. 6, 1981, Draft Order	Submit three plans to the Court: a curriculum program plan, a facility improvement plan, and a plan for staffing which fits the curricular program.	
	March 3, 1982 District level recommendations; May 27, 1982 Superintendent's filing	1. Curriculum a. Special collaboration with the HHORC.	a. There has been collaboration; it has been especially useful for supplying needed equipment.
		b. A "career-oriented theme" will be developed.	b. The theme is computers. There are two computer rooms now, and a third will be added. Teachers are receiving special inservice. Intensive recruiting around this theme will not begin until the headmaster has assurance that the full program is in place.
		c. •A 9th grade school-within-a-school will be established with team teaching and guidance and an emphasis on basic skills.	c. •The program has been established. The students are clustered according to ability. U. Mass Boston is providing tehnical assistance.
		• An improved promotion rate for 9th graders will result.	• It is still early to evaluate results, but it seems that the 9th graders have been stabilized. Attendance rates for both white and black students have resulted, and teacher communication has been improved.

School	Court Order Reference	Monitoring Issue	Findings
		d. A career-oriented theme and a "communications arts" program will attract grade 10-12 students.	d. • The career-oriented computer program is being successfully implemented; see above, b. • The "communications arts" program has not worked well. Appropriate teaching staff have not been provided. The program will be reconsidered at end of the year.
		2. Staffing	
		• Nine new teachers and one assistant headmaster will be provided.	a. All the staff promised in the court filing have been provided with the exception of several positions designated for the communications arts program.
		3. Facilities	
		• Approximately $1.5 million worth of improvements will be made, contingent on passage of the "Tregor Bill."	• Renovations are scheduled to begin in the summer of 1983, pending approval of the Massachusetts Board of Education, which has required assurance that the Burke will be retained as a secondary-school facility.

Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

SPECIAL DESEGREGATION MONITORING

The Mario Umana Technical High School

Findings

The administration of the Umana produced convincing evidence that the magnet technical school is offering unique programs with strong appeal to students. Other sources support these contentions. Analysis of student preferences (manifested through filling out application forms) reveals that the Umana "is a remarkably attractive school to all racial groups, capable of accommodating only a small proportion of applicants." (See the report, "Student Preferences, p. 19.) Data analysis also demonstrates that the existence of the Umana is particularly important for Black students, for whom district high schools serve perceived needs poorly. ("Preferences," p. 9.) Moreover, the Umana is the only non-examination school in Boston offering technical training at the college preparatory level; Boston's citywide examination schools render disproportionately low service to the city's Black students. Because the administration of the Umana appears to have established a school with minimal racial tensions, the Umana is an integrated school of the sort envisioned by the Court, despite the fact that it is located in a potentially hostile area.

The monitoring team was told that support for the schools seems to have been adversely affected by widespread rumors that it would cause to be a magnet high school.

East Boston High School

Background

Although the students of District VIII were exempted from mandatory reassignment, in 1975 the Court ordered that East Boston High School be made a citywide technical high school and the Barnes Middle School a magnet. Various considerations persuaded the Court that East Boston High School should remain a district high school, but with magnet programs to attract out-of-district minority students; the Barnes Middle School became the site of the Umana Technical High School. In 1977 the Court accepted a plan for East Boston High School that proposed two magnet elements: the machine shop (already a magnet under the provisions of the Unified Plan for Occupational Education); and a new "business magnet" which was to be unique, and attractive to minorities. The Court ordered that the business magnet comply strictly with magnet ratios and restrictions for citywide schools and programs, and ordered that seats be set aside for the program: 200 in 1977-78, 300 in 1978-79, and 400 in 1979-80.

Some misgivings were expressed that the business magnet might become an internally segregated program apart from the regular school. On 3 January, 1979, the Court requested the Department of Implementation to file a report explaining, among other things, "present transfer policy as it applies to minority students currently enrolled in the East Boston High School Business Magnet program who wish to transfer into academic courses at East Boston High School."

The response filed with the Court dated 31 January, 1979 explains that for purposes of assignment and transfers, the Department of Implementation treats East Boston High School, the business magnet and the machine shop as three separate "schools." Only one sentence in the report directly addresses the Court's questions: "To obtain a desegregative or programmatic assignment from one 'school' to another we in the Department of Implementation are obliged by Court Order to consider seat availability and the racial/ethnic improvement of both sending and receiving 'schools.'" A reasonable inference is that the Department of Implementation treated requests on a case-by-case basis, using two criteria, set availability and impact on desegregation. In like manner, the report filed by the East Boston Special Monitoring Board, also requested by the Court, cites "the pertinent sections" of the student transfer policy:

> B. Programmatic: based upon the student's documentable preference or need...and based on the racial ethnic compositions of sending and receiving schools....
>
> C. Desegregative: based upon the improvement of the racial compositions of the sending and receiving schools.

The issue would appear to have been settled in favor of permitting such transfers under the stated conditions, and indeed an internal memorandum of the Department of Education reveals that the Department of Implementation agreed to designate a staff member to coordinate transfer requests of this sort. However, on the monitoring visit made to East Boston High School on 3 May, 1983, school administrators related that (1) both black and white students continue to request such transfers, (2) the Department of Implementation states that such transfers are impossible for out-of-district students, who are primarily minority, and (3) both in-district and out-of-district students requesting transfers usually end up at Madison Park or English High.

On May 5, an attempt was made to clarify Department of Implementation policy during a telephone conversation. The following information was conveyed. First, all magnet students not residing in District VIII are treated as students of their sending district. For students from Districts I through VII, the regular program at East Boston High School is not an option, since it does not appear on those students' personalized /computerized applications forms. The first rule applied by the Department of Implementation when receiving such requests is: "No inter-district programmatic [or] desegregative...transfer may be requested or received within District I - VIII for grades 1 to 12." (Procedural Manual, Nov., 1980)

Second, even if such requests could be entertained, they could not be accommodated for minority out-of-district students because the proportion of minority students at East Boston High School exceeds the Court-ordered proportion; when calculating the racial proportions of East Boston High School, the Department of Implementation includes the students of the machine shop and business magnet. Third, different rules apply for students residing in District VIII, whether white or minority. They may request transfer to East Boston High School, and all such requests are submitted to the lottery. Any student not receiving a seat at East Boston High School is protected by the "present school guarantee," which, as is implied, guarantees the students the option of remaining in the business magnet.

Findings

The administration of East Boston High School made a strong case that it is conscientiously complying with the requirements of the business magnet plan, and is attempting to meet the needs of the business magnet students. Approximately 300 students are assigned to the program each year, 100 students fewer than the Court mandated. Racial proportions conform roughly to the citywide ratios, but the proportion of Blacks exceeds the high allowable limit this year, and the assigned proportions for next year show an even higher proportion of Blacks (58% in April of 1983; 67% assigned for 1983-84). A four-year business magnet is offered with three options: legal-medical clerical and secretarial, reprographics and computerized accounting. Business magnet students are integrated into the student body for all non-magnet classes. However, since only magnet students are eligible for the magnet classes, those classes are in effect identifiable by comparison with the remainder of the school.

The business magnet is a Black program in a white school; the enrollment of East Boston High School proper, i.e., excluding the two magnets, is 98% white. East Boston High School administrators related that students refer to the business magnet as a program "for Blacks": it is doubtful that the Court intended to create a racially-identifiable program.

The relatively low proportion of whites in the program is difficult to explain. Analysis of student preferences for 1983-84 reveals that 21 white students indicated the business magnet as their first preference; only 20 were assigned. Additionally, many students from East Boston listed the business magnet as their second or third choice.

The ground for East Boston High School's contention that the program is magnetic and unique are dubious. With the possible exception of reprographics, courses of comparable content and quality are available elsewhere; whether "the duplication of office paperwork" is a valuable student major is open to question.

It should be emphasized that alongside the business magnet are two other business programs whose white students are barred from the magnet classes--one is a college business program which prepares students for higher education as well as employment in business occupations. Minority students residing outside District VIII have no access to the college business program, which has the potential for being truly magnetic.

Finally, business magnet students are, for all intents and purposes, "locked in" the magnet program. Students who develop new aspirations as a result of their exposure to the business magnet cannot transfer to a different program in East Boston High School. Most important, they cannot transfer to a college preparatory program. East Boston High School officials attempt to accommodate such students by ensuring that their electives are college prep. However, the magnet program is not sufficiently flexible to allow a full college prep level. Since neither math nor foreign language training is prescribed for magnet students in grades 10 through 12, two electives per year would be required for a minimal college preparation. Only one year of the reprographics schedule allows time for two electives. Even the computerized accounting program does not appear to offer actual training in computer languages as substitute for a foreign language.

Problem Areas

1. Current Department of Implementation policy does not permit minority students to transfer into a college preparatory program at East Boston High School; school defendant filings in this regard were insufficiently explicit and potentially misleading. Nor is it possible for students to remain in the business magnet and receive sufficient college preparatory training.

2. The Court's policy of prohibiting inter-district transfers appears in this case to affect desegregation adversely, because Black student

transfers from the magnet to the regular program at East Boston High School would lower the excessively high Black proportion in the magnet and increase the extraordinarily low proportion of Blacks in the regular program.

3. Are the Department of Implementation policies in this regard in conformity with the Court's intentions? First, should magnet students not residing in District VIII be considered students of District IX, District VIII, or of the district in which they reside? Second, should the Department of Implementation treat East Boston High School as single unit when calculating racial proportions (i.e., include machine and buisness magnet students), but treat the magnets and East Boston High School as distinct units for purposes of considering student transfer requests?

4. An attempt to modify the student transfer policy to permit transfers from the magnet to the regular school programs might be appropriate. Assignment rules have been modified to permit inter-district desegregative transfers to Burke and Dorchester High Schools. Why promote desegregation of an identifiably Black school, but not of an identifiably White school?

5. The magnetic features of the program should be enhanced. For example, the business magnet might be merged with the college business program; the result would indeed be a unique program for Boston.

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
John R. Coakley, Senior Officer

May 17, 1983

Mr. Peter Ingeneri
Community Superintendent
District VIII
East Boston High School
86 White Street
East Boston, MA 02128

Dear Peter,

I again am writing in regard to East Boston High School. The Federal Court Order of May 6, 1977 affirmed the plan of the school department (of which you were a leading force) for a magnet business program at East Boston High School. The Court said: "A key feature of this order is that composition of the student body enrolled in the business programs adhere strictly to District 9 racial-ethnic guidelines......." The Court also decreed that by 1979-80 the capacity of the program should be "at least 400."

If you request, I can provide you a detailed analysis of enrollments in the Business Education Program at East Boston High School. To my knowledge they have hovered around 300 each December since 1979. (I use December as a logical time for measuring a school's enrollment. However, you will observe that the May enrollment each year has been closer to 275.)

The point which should be made to staff and administration at East Boston High School is that the racial ethnic enrollment of the Boston Public Schools has changed significantly since 1976-1977. Please examine the contrast:

District IX Racial/Ethnic Goals for 1977-78

	Black	White	Other
High	47%	50%	13%
Ideal	43%	45%	12%
Low	39%	40%	11%

District IX Racial Ethnic Goals for 1983-84 (High School)

	Black	White	Other
High	57%	33%	20%
Ideal	53%	28%	19%
Low	49%	23%	18%

We try to remain faithful to the white percentage range at East Boston High School's Business Education Program. Often, however, it is necessary -- and legitimate -- to remain faithful to the combined Black and Other Minority percentage. To do differently, as you who are a mathematics major know, would be to drastically reduce the enrollment. The initial assignment enrollment for 1983-84 in the program -- if we ever get permission to issue assignments -- will be 29% White, 65% Black and 6% Other Minority. In contrast, in December 1977 the program's enrollment was 48% White, 49% Black and 3% Other Minority.

In view of Mr. Poto's alleged assertions to the Department of Education's Monitor, I do feel obliged to convey this "record-straightening" letter to Doctor Glenn.

Sincerely,

John R Coakley

Senior Officer

JC:ab

xc: Charles Glenn
Franklin Banks

Burke and Dorchester High Schools

Background

In a memorandum dated 6 November, 1981, the Court stated, "We are persuaded that special remedial measures are necessary at Burke and Dorchester High in order to meet the court's dual objective of desegregation and enhancement of educational opportunity." Two considerations brought the Court to this step.

First, both of the District V schools had become resegregated minority institutions. An unacceptably low percentage of white students had been assigned to both (9% at the Burke, 14% at Dorchester, when the allowable minimum was 19%). Assignment of white students to citywide schools was partially responsible; 913, or 33% of the 2,773 District V high school students assigned outside the district, were white. If only 130 of them had been assigned to district V, enrollment guidelines would have been met. The actual enrollment pattern of the two schools deviated even further from the ideal because (1) there was a high percentage of minority late enrollee assignments (i.e., after the Court's review), and (2) few of the whites assigned to the schools actuall attended (20 out of 66 assigned at the Burke, 75 of 152 assigned at Dorchester).

Second, the Court had "received numerous reports from plaintiffs and others of understaffing, underequipping and nonmaintenance...." The Court reasoned that neither school would be able to attract and retain in sufficient numbers of students to comply with enrollment guidelines unless special desegregation measures were taken that went beyond reassignment of students.

Consequently, the Court presented an order in draft form that required assignment patterns in compliance with District guidelines, and plans for the improvement of both schools. During the winter and spring of 1982, Boston Public Schools submitted a series of plans that, when considered together, essentially fulfill the requirements of the draft order. These include a "Response to Court Draft Order Relative to Burke and Dorchester High Schools" developed by a district-level Comprehensive Planning Committee dated 27 January; a "Process for Implementation" prepared by the Department of Implementation, dated 8 February, a revised and expanded "Process for Implementation" dated 24 March; and a series of memoranda concerning student assignments, procedures for funding the proposed improvements, and the details of the system-level commitment to the two schools.

The plan for the Burke has five parts. The main features of the curriculum improvement component are coordination and technical assistance from the Occupational Resource Center, especially for the development of a "career-oriented theme," a ninth grade school within a school, with the goal of improving promotion rates; and enchancement of the 10-12 curriculum, with technical assistance

262

from the University of Massachusetts. The staffing plan promised nine additional teaching and administrative staff to the Burke, with areas of specialization to match the curriculum plan. Specifications for the facilities improvement of the Burke estimated that the cost of capital improvements to bring the school up to standard would be $1.89 million with new windows, or $1.31 million with repaired windows. The school security section established procedures to ensure the safety of persons entering, leaving and inside the building; to prevent the entry of unauthorized persons; and to minimize internal disruptions, especially in hallways, lavatories and the lunchroom. Finally, a recruitment plan for students is included.

The requirements of the draft order with respect to Dorchester High School were less extensive and the plan filed for that school is thinner. However, the planning procedure at Dorchester appears to have benefited from its inclusion with the Burke in a district-wide improvement plan, and its plan addresses the same five areas as the Burke plan. A curriculum plan had not been required, but one is included, although curriculum improvement is treated cursorily. The primary new element is the career-oriented theme of "human services," which envisions "career orientation in sociology, law, youth services, law enforcement, government services, as well as academic programs for health careers."

Although the Court did require an assessment of the staffing needs of Dorchester High School, the district-level plan does not specify additional staffing needs, either for the regular curriculum or the proposed new program. The supplementary staffing eventually promised by Superintendent Spillane is a miscellaneous assortment that bears no clear relation to the curriculum proposal. Facilities improvement, however, received sustained attention at the district level; staff attributed the school's reputation for being unsafe and unattractive to the delapidated physical plant. The plan calls for $1.116 million of capital improvements. Similarly, Dorchester's safety and security plan is extensive, reflecting the staff's concerns; it addresses security personnel, internal reporting procedures, maintenance or order, and so on. A minimal recruiting plan is also included.

In addition the Department of Implementation, which had been required to submit revised assignment procedures to ensure acceptable enrollment patterns, indicated that it would (1) limit the options of District V students in magnet schools either to their present school or to their community district school and (2) permit desegregative transfers of white and other minority students from other districts.

Findings

During the 1982-83 school years, both schools submitted periodic "updates" of their progress in implementing the improvement plans": attendance patterns, physical plant maintenance, staffing needs, etc. Evidence of continuing support for the two schools comes from these updates, in a May 3 memorandum from Deputy Superintendent Peterkin to Superintendent Spillane promising funds and four staff positions (new and reinstated) to each school.

Enrollment patterns do not show significant improvement despite the assurance of the Department of Implementation that, with the exception of one student, "since June 6, 1982 no white students from District V...received an assignment other than Burke or Dorchester or received a transfer out of the two schools." (Memorandum of April 8, 1982) As of May, 1983, the enrollment of Burke was 9% white, and that of Dorchester was 14% white. The number of regularly-attending whites does seem to have increased. In November, 1981, the date of the original draft order, 20 whites attended the Burke and 75 whites attended Dorchester. In May, 1983, 55 whites were in attendance at the Burke and 117 at Dorchester. The Department of Education's analysis of assignments for 1983-84 shows that the number of whites assigned has increased (74 to the Burke, 126 to Dorchester), and reveals increased proportions of whites in the lower grades, an encouraging sign.

However, the size of the assigned 9th grade class has changed significantly from the current year at the Burke.

BURKE

9th Grade	Total	Black	%	White	%	Other Minority
Attending 5/83	231	170	74	35	15	24
Assigned 83-84	88	46	52	33	38	9

The effect of this drastic reduction in class size is not immediately apparent. On the one hand, it may offer Headmaster Holland the opportunity to enhance educational quality through improved teacher-student ratios, etc.

On the other hand, the loss of two-thirds of the anticipated entering class may undermine Burke's justification for its tenuously-maintained staff, not to mention the promised additional staff. The shock need not have been so rude. If assignments have been made according to ideal percentages, keeping same number of whites, the class size would have been doubled.

Total	White	Black	Other Minority
156	33	113	19

A memorandum from John Coakley of the Department of Implementation dated 23 May, 1983 notes that "to my amazement," 45 white students had been assigned outside District V; 20 live in Burke geocodes, 25 in Dorchester geocodes. According to Mr. Coakley, almost all these students were prospective ninth graders.

It should be noted that no denial of first preference is involved, as only 40 8th grade District V students expressed a first preference for either Burke or Dorchester.

The plans for capital improvement at the two schools have been delayed by problems encountered in obtaining funding sources, and by the insistence, on the part of both the City of Boston and the Department of Education, that Boston Public Schools provide assurances that both schools will be retained as part of the secondary school system. Such assurances have now been obtained, despite the lack of a long-range secondary school plan for Boston, and there is hope that bids for the capital improvements will be let early this summer. (See report on Facilities.)

The focus of curriculum and staffing development at Dorchester seems to have been its magnet programs, all of which have career themes; the fruits of coordination with the Occupational Resource Center are apparent. A specifically-focused "Health Careers" program has evolved from the unfocused "Human Services" proposed originally. Boston Public Schools officials have made commitments to Dorchester for planning funds and for administrative staff for the program. The program's objectives are not yet clear (job readiness, academic preparation, or something else?), perhaps because there is no administrative staff yet. Nevertheless, students have been recruited to it for 1983-84.

A recent assessment of the magnet industrial-cooperative programs at Dorchester has resulted in plans to eliminate the upholstery program, and to contract the wood-finishing component of the woodworking program. It is titled, "architectural woodworking" on the 1983-84 student assignment forms. In addition, "urban retrofit" is listed as a magnet vocational program for 1983-84; planning will be required to ensure that local funds are available for urban retrofit in subsequent years, when federal funds are no longer available.

Any attempt to comply with the Court's requirement that the Burke be made "attractive" to students (that is, to students with real alternatives to their public district school) would face formidable obstacles. Persuasive evidence was presented suggesting that the administrative leadership of the Boston Public Schools and the Burke have made progress toward compliance. Order and safety have been restored to the school; curriculum innovations have been introduced and are being evaluated; staffing patterns have been improved; and renovation of facilities should commence in the near future. However, the stability that has been achieved is fragile, and is jeopardized by (1) disruptive "social promotions" in mid term through administrative discretion of large numbers of students from the Cleveland Middle and (2) low staff morale occasioned by the annual cycle of layoffs and teacher reassignments.

The support for the Burke and Dorchester leadership in recent months by central office and district administration is one of the more positive desegregation developments in Boston, and should be continued and strengthened. Staff stability and morale are absolutely essential to implementation of what is essentially a "magnet" approach to desegregation of these schools, not to mention their implications for the quality of education and the school climate. Such practices as mid-term "social promotions" have a destabilizing effect on students and on instruction, and should be considered very carefully as well.

Two developments occurred too recently for discussion during the monitoring visits:

(a) as the final draft of the Report was being prepared for the Commissioner's review (June 7th), we received the requested report on activities to carry out Superintendent Spillane's 1982 commitments to the Court on Burke and Dorchester. This report has been included in Volume 2, but it is not the basis for any conclusions.

(b) on May 31st John Coakley called Charles Glenn to discuss a possible modification of the approved assignments to the Burke. As noted in this report, only 89 students have been assigned to the ninth grade, with the potential result of a 38% white enrollment in that grade - if all the assigned students actually attend. The effect would be to bring the white proportion in the entire enrollment to a projected 14%, just under the 15%-25% permitted range. The proposal had been advanced to assign an additional 100 minority students to the ninth grade; the effect would be to make the school 12% white and the ninth grade 18% white. Glenn expressed willingness to consider some increase in the assigned ninth grade, suggesting that 25% white - the upper limit of the permitted range for the school - might be a reasonable goal; this would permit assignment of an additional 47 minority students, and make the school 13.3% white.

It might be noted that a very large ninth grade was assigned to Burke in 1982, but that the projected 11th and 12th grades are smaller than the 9th grade would be with 47 additional students.

It was agreed that no decision would be made without a formal proposal to change the proposed assignments, and that a first step to such a proposal would be to invite minority eighth graders at the three District V middle schools who have received assignments other than Burke whether they would prefer to attend Burke. Coakley agreed that all students in the district who gave Burke as their first preference, and most who gave it as their second, have already been assigned there.

A final consideration is the commitment - of great importance - by Deputy Superintendent Peterkin that the staff level of the Burke will not be reduced because of a low assigned enrollment. Glenn noted that the "rebuilding" of South Boston High School had been facilitated by a time of low enrollments, and that now that school is drawing an increasing enrollment and first preferences from minority students.

Charlie Glenn 7/2

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
John R. Coakley, Senior Officer

June 9, 1983

MEMORANDUM

To: Robert Spillane

From: John Coakley John Coakley

Subject: Burke School Enrollment (Follow-up to My Comments to School Committee)

1. The Issue: low ninth grade enrollments for 1983-84 at Burke High School and Dorchester High School

2. Observation:

    a. Number of District V Black and Other Minority Students not assigned to grade 9, Burke or Dorchester = 440

    b. Those who received their first choice schools (other than Burke or Dorchester) = 332

    c. Received their second choices = 22

    d. Received their third choices = 9

    e. Received none of their choices = 15

    f. Made no choices, not assigned to Burke or Dorchester = 62

3. Comment: There were 363 Black and Other Minority students who specifically didn't ask for Burke or Dorchester or who preferred other schools. There were 62 who didn't ask for anything and arguably could have been assigned to Burke or Dorchester instead of English or Madison. (However, the fact that they did not return applications may carry its own significance.) There were 15 students who were not well-served by the assignment process and arguably could have been assigned to Burke or Dorchester.

832

4. Approach: On June 8, 1983 Burke and Dorchester were provided with lists of possible recruits from the above numbers. Special transfer forms and address labels were provided. The two Headmasters were urged to contact students on the lists and ask them to accept assignments to Burke and Dorchester. (I have contacted staff of the Massachusetts Department of Education about this effort.) My office will transfer any volunteers promptly. The two Headmasters were given sufficient names for Burke to increase its ninth grade enrollment by at least 60 and for Dorchester to increase by at least 50. If the initial lists are "exhausted" we will provide additional names. (Staff of the Department of Implementation's External Liaison Unit were asked to contact the two Headmasters and offer assistance in the recruitment. It is assumed, of course, that the two schools will seek the involvement of members of the Parent Councils and teachers whose students may have graduated.)

JC:ab
Enclosure

xc: Robert Peterkin
Mildred Griffith
Catherine Ellison

Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

April 5, 1983

Mr. John Coakley
Boston Public Schools
26 Court Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Dear Mr. Coakley:

I have reviewed the extensive material available to us bearing upon "special desegregation" measures at Burke and Dorchester High Schools. It seems to me that Superintendent Spillane's May 27th 1982 memorandum to Marshall Simonds represents as definitive a statement as is available on what the School Department has voluntarily agreed to do. Unless you have a better suggestion, we will use this memorandum as the basis for our monitoring efforts.

Let me suggest that the responsible administrators prepare a status report on administrative approvals, staffing arrangments, program changes, and recruitment efforts. In effect, this would involve simply a summary and interpretation of the monthly updates which have been developed in recent months, in relation to the May 1982 commitments.

Such a status report would serve not only the monitoring process but also the expected review, in May or June, of plans for renovation with state reimbursement.

In addition to the status of ongoing efforts, I would appreciate your goals for 1983 assignments to the two schools. How many applications from white students are received this Spring by comparison with 1981 and 1982? Are white students from District V being assigned to other non-examination schools?

I have asked Michael Alves to arrange to visit the two schools over the next month, with a representative of the Department of Implementation.

Cordially,

Charles Glenn

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
JUN 07 1983
BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL
OPPORTUNITY

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
EXTERNAL LIAISON UNIT

STATUS REPORT ON DORCHESTER HIGH SCHOOL AND JEREMIAH E. BURKE HIGH SCHOOL

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide a status report in summary format with a focus on the areas sited in your request of April, 1983 to John Coakley concerning the J.E. Burke and Dorchester High Schools. Efforts will be made to respond to your inquiries about administrative approvals, staffing arrangements, program changes and recruitment. As you may recall, John Coakley requested that Lydia Francis and I relieve the headmasters of this task, but receive their endorsements of the written response prior to forwarding the report to you. You also will find comments from the two headmasters and the Community District V Superintendent as part of the conclusion of this report.

Therefore, this response will follow the order of your concerns as listed in the second paragraph of your letter of April 1983 as follows:

I. Administrative Approvals

On May 27. 1982 Dr. Spillane responded to specific programmatic and staffing plans for Burke and Dorchester High Schools. In this memorandum to Marshall Simonds, he incorporated administrative approvals for program changes, staffing and facilities improvements that were being sought for each school. This document authorized Counsel for the School Department to file the following information to complete a previous court filing with respect to recommendations for J. E. Burke and Dorchester High Schools in response to the November 6, 1981 Draft Court Order. Those recommendations were:

A. Additional staffing and programmatic assistance from HHORC.

B. Strengthen administrative staff at each school.

C. Formation of task force of teachers, parents and students to initiate program development.

D. Commitment of $500,000 in FY83 Budget to implement plan.

E. Assignment of students to Grade 9 so as to stay within complinace for both schools.

F. Formation of task force to provide assistance and specific types of support to both schools.

Status Report
Dorchester High School

II. Supplementary Staff (1982-1983)

A. The following staffing arrangement was finalized for the 1982-83 School Year:

1-Mathematics teacher
1-English teacher
1-Social Studies teacher
*1-Vocal Music Teacher
1-Typing teacher
1-Science/Chemistry teacher
1-Reading teacher
**1-R.O.T.C. teacher
1-Bilingual Resource Room teacher

*Later changed to a Reading teacher
**Not filled: Unable to complete necessary sanctions.

B. FY84 Implications: Issues presented by the headmaster in monthly reports:

1. Reduction of Department Heads from 8 to 4. (Bilingual, Physical Education, Business Education, Foreign Language eliminated).
2. No funding for Two Coordinators for Special Magnet
3. Overall-administration reduction = 4

III. Program Changes

A. Program 1982-83:

1. Human Services Program was initiated in September, 1982.
2. Ten courses were organized for this program as cited in one of the headmaster's monthly report. Presently the program provides instructional opportunities in the Human Services area on an elective basis for the entire student population. A more intensive approach to basic skill instruction is also on-going.

B. Proposed Program 1983-84:

1. Plans have been finalized for the introduction of a Health Careers Program with a special Magnet Component called Health Services/ Basic Skills for the 1983-84 school year. The purpose of this special magnet is to encourage voluntary desegregation of Dorchester High School.

2. Collaboration with HHORC has been arranged for related technical training for students for the 1983-84 school year at this site, while the home school provides the basic academic skills with clinical experiences to be arranged in the public sector, i.e., hospitals, clinics, etc.

3. Coordinators for the Academic component and the Clinical component will supervise these student activities and are key to the success of the new magnet.

4. Some of the course offerings that are being provided in the Human Services program will be continued as part of this special magnet. Enrollment in the special magnet will be open to 9th and 10th graders. The entry levels designated are consistent with entry levels for other similar city-wide vocational occupational programs. Grade 11 students will be recruited from within the school.

5. The curriculum for this special magnet has not been fully developed. Curriculum modification is to begin immediately.

6. The Dorchester Task Force Planning Committee meets regularly as a support mechanism to all planning efforts.

C. FY84 Budget Implications/Issues Presented by the Headmaster:

1. Funding for two coordinators (clinical and academic) required for September 1983 implementation of magnet program.

2. Funding allocation for development of curriculum for September 1983 required.

D. Other On-going Program Changes at Dorchester High School that are not Related to the Special Magnet Program Include:

1. Job Collaborative - Career awareness and employment readiness (already implemented).

2. Comprehensive Adolescent Parenting Program (C.A.P.P.-already implemented).

3. School Improvement Program (University of Massachusetts) (already implemented).

4. Bilingual Secretary Program (in its developmental stage).

5. Efforts are being made to obtain a qualified R.O.T.C. instructor by the 1983-84 school year.

6. Mini-computers and word processors have been installed and instruction for computer literacy is available to all students.

7. An educational collaborative has been developed. It includes Private Industry Council, Dorchester/Mattapan Mental Health, Comprehensive Adolescent Parenting Program, U-Mass, Teacher Corp and New England Telephone.

8. Parent Recruitment-Open House Parental Recruitment Program was held in October of 1982.

IV. Recruitment Efforts

A. Recruitment Activities for 1982-83:

1. Some of the Recruitment Teams visited public schools, private schools, some community agencies and parent groups.

2. An increase in white student population is noticeable due to the Department of Implementation's assignment efforts—even though it is still not significant.

B. Recruitment Activities 1983-84

1. Recruitment teams were formed consisting of parents, students and concerned persons. These teams:
   - a. Discussed strategies.
   - b. Prepared printed materials.
   - c. Prepared a slide/tape presentation.
2. A recruiting team had a table and gave a slide presentation at the Popes Hill Civic Association High School Day at Boston College High School on October 17, 1982. This was attended by over one thousand parents of eighth grade students.
3. A large number of faculty members and administrators attended a Parent Fair at the University of Massachusetts/Boston in October. This was done in conjunction with the Jeremiah Burke High School in an attempt to give parents of students in the schools a better insight into the programs which were available at the schools.
4. A four page school newsletter, which was printed in March, was widely distributed.
5. News stories were printed in the Dorchester Argus and Dorchester Community News two weeks before student assignment applications were distributed.
6. A four-page brochure for the Health Careers Magnet Program was printed by New England Telephone. This was widely distributed.
7. General posters and brochures were printed and distributed.
8. Recruiting teams gave a presentation in three Dorchester middle schools and sent materials to parochial schools.
9. The strategy for the 1983-84 school year will include an effort at retention of assigned students. A welcome letter and a copy of the school newsletter will be sent to all new students immediately after assignments are issued.
10. Extensive public relations efforts will be attempted during the entire 1983-84 school year in an effort to improve the public perception of the school.

Conclusion:

Comments from Headmaster:

The conversion of Human Services to Health Careers was based on the following:

1. The need for a magnet theme.
2. The need for a program and not a series of isolated courses.
3. The Human Services field is too broad to attract students.

If the Health Careers and Basic Skills Program is to become an integral part of Dorchester High School's instructional curriculum, all aspects of the program must be funded from the base budget.

At the present the major renovations and alteration schedule presents some significant operational problems for next year. The scope of the work to be completed cannot logistically be accomplished while school is in session and bids and contracts continue to extend the initiation of the renovations closer to September. Most minor alterations have been successfully completed.

Status Report
Jeremiah E. Burke High School

V. Supplementary Staff (1982-83)

A. The following staffing arrangement was finalized for the 1982-83 school year:

2-Reading teachers
2-Mathematics teachers
1-English teacher
1-Social Studies teacher
1-Business teacher
1-Photography teacher
1-Music teacher
1-Assistant Headmaster
*1-New Administrative Position
(Counseling, general outreach, deal directly with families, pupil services, home visits)

B. FY84

1. To retain 9th grade coordinator for cluster.
2. To receive 10th grade coordinator for cluster for 1983-84.

VI. Program Changes:

A. Program 1982-83

1. Communications/ Arts and Computer Science was finalized as the major school wide theme for instructional purposes for all students.

2. Unlike Dorchester High School, the Burke High School does not have a special magnet component but offers grade clustering for all 9th grade students for this school year with a 9th grade coordinator who stays in close contact with students.

   a. All 9th grade cluster teachers meet daily to discuss and address issues pertaining to the cluster needs.

   b. An introduction to the keyboard and computers will be offered to 9th grade students. Word Processing, Data Processing and Computer Math are offered for upper classmen.

3. Staff is attempting to structure the academic program towards college and career preparation. Therefore, curriculum is being refined and made more meaningful to the students.

4. The Distributive Educational Program established by Boston Public Schools has provided job placement for some students who attend school for approximately 4 hours a day.

5. The following activities and program options are available for the majority of the students:

    a. The Educational Collaborative with University of Massachusetts offers a College Preparatory Program for students who are able to attend 2 nights per week, or receive tutorial services and/or take courses to enable them to have access to the University later.

    b. New England Life Insurance and Private Industry Council provides 60 after school jobs for Burke High School students. New England Life offers materials, mailing assistance, seminars, career information, and has assisted in various other areas.

    c. Metropathways provides a program for certain students at Boston University, one day a week.

    d. A parenting program is in place through the YWCA, as well as an Alcoholic program with the Dimock Street Health Center twice weekly.

    e. Extra Curricular and activity periods are proving to be successful and attractive to a number of students, i.e., ski club, backgammon, computer club, athletics, volunteer dance group (University of Massachusetts), student government, student leadership, and etc.

    f. Provisions are made to transport parents to the school upon request and to transport students home when necessary via a school van assigned by Department of Implementation.

B. Program Plans - 1983-84

1. Counseling services will be offered through the school's psychologist, and community agencies that are near students' residences.

2. Staff will continue to structure the academic program for college and career preparation, as well as refine the curriculum.

3. Clustering style schedule is being developed for 10th graders.

4. The intent of the Headmaster is to continue to offer a wide range of activities and programs as well as to expand the course offerings.

VII. Recruitment Efforts

A. Recruitment Activities 1982-83:

1. Preparation of brochures, slide tape-presentation, posters, Burke T-shirts.
2. Press Conference and press release.
3. Media coverage.
4. Recruitment of 8th graders at the three District V Middle Schools.
5. Involvement of parents: meetings, informational packets.

C. Recruitment Activities 1983-84:

1. All middle school 8th graders in District V toured the Burke High School this year before the application/assignment process began.
2. Channel 2 Public Broadcasting System continues to offer an on-going series about Burke High School once a week in an effort to upgrade the image of the school.
3. A recruitment booth was set up by the 9th grade cluster at the Catholic School Recruitment Conference with brochures and slide tape as well as a computer display.

Conclusion:

Comments from Headmaster:

This coming school year we will direct more of our efforts toward programming for greater flexibility in course offerings that will emphasize the development of reading skills in the content areas. Other major program changes will highlight our computer science courses in the building of a computer magnet. Expansion of this program will result in greater exposure of a larger number of students to the growing computer field while allowing for the utilization of more flexible computer software in the area of developmental skills.

We look forward to next year with great expectations for improved curriculum offerings for our students as well as overdue renovations in our physical plant. The 1.4 million dollars rehabilitation project that is underway to repair and restore this facility will have a positive impact on students, parents and staff.

My greatest concern is the retention of effective personnel who have worked very hard over the past school year to improve the school. Staffing may be the key factor next year as we attempt to continue to upgrade this school especially in the area of computer science and other curriculum changes that already show signs of stabilizing the school's academic programs. This school's hopes are built on the retention of able staff who will fulfill their responsibilities, and my ability to recommend and effect release of staff who are unwilling or unable to perform those tasks that will enable us to work together as a team to rebuild Burke High School to a full fledged comprehensive high school.

APPENDIX A

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF THE COMMUNITY SUPERINTENDENT
DISTRICT FIVE
MILDRED B. GRIFFITH

May 24, 1983

MEMORANDUM

TO: Catherine Ellison, Implementation
FROM: Mildred B. Griffith, Community Superintendent M. B. Griffith

Enclosed please find comments from me. I found your recording of the status report to be very accurate and objective.

Dorchester High School - The District Task Force has proven to be an effective mechanism for planning and monitoring the progress and status of the voluntary desegregation of the two high schools. The Task Force for Dorchester High has met on a regular basis at two-week intervals, with representation of broad based constituencies present at the meetings. This will continue to happen.

The Health Careers Magnet Program was based on the need to prepare students for the current job market. The orginal Human Services Theme was broad by design in order to allow the people most affected by the program to have imput in making a more definitive theme. This evolved in a timely fashion. It is imperative that the stability and permanency of the Headmasters position be established in order for progress to continue.

The result of the present assignment progress related to the health careers program shown is a diminution of grade 9 population which may seriously effect the future of the school. While positive results are a greater percentage of white students that have been assigned, the negative results are recorded below.

1982 — 9th grade assignments — Dorchester High
191 Black, 65 White, 58 Hispanic, 314 Total

1983 Assignment
123 Black, 72 White, 49 Other, 244 Total

Burke High School - The Burke School is continuing to refine its program. The concern about the assignment of 9th grade students to the Burke is even more pronounced. The total number of 9th graders assigned may be even more devastating.

1982 — 9th grade assignments — Burke High
156 Black, 49 White, 34 Other, 239 Total

1983 Assignment
45 Black, 34 White, 9 Other, 88 Total

Since Burke has not been used as an evening school site, thefts and damages to equipment have diminished.

The Burke School's recruiting team had a table and gave a slide presentation at the Popes Hill Civic Association High School Day at Boston College High School on October 17, 1982. This was attended by over one thousand parents of eighth grade students.

In conclusion the extended effort of school and district personnel has resulted in the noteable progress made to date.

May

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT
SCHOOL OPERATIONS
ROBERT S. PETERKIN

MEMORANDUM

To: Superintendent Robert R. Spillane

From: Robert S. Peterkin, Deputy Superintendent/School Operations

Re: Correction on Burke/Dorchester Memorandum of May 3, 1983

Date: May 6, 1983

Please note the following correction to my memorandum on Dorchester High School:

> With respect to the administration of Dorchester High School, it should be noted that Mr. Swartz agreed to trade off a teaching position for the Registrar's position.
>
> My memorandum was in error when it indicated that Mr. Swartz was able to trade off the registrar's position.

Given the new complexity of programming at Dorchester High School, the position of Registrar is essential. Therefore, pending the supplemental appropriations, Mr. Swartz will cancel one teaching position for the Registrar's.

Thank you for your cooperation.

RSP/jMc

cpy: Deputy Superintendent Oliver Lancaster
Deputy Superintendent Rosemarie Rosen
Director James Caradonio
Senior Officer John Coakley
Community Superintendent Mildred Griffith
Headmaster Albert Holland
Headmaster Stanley Swartz

26 COURT STREET, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108 • 726-6200 EXT 5300 AREA 617

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
John R. Coakley, Senior Officer

May 23, 1983

MEMORANDUM

To: Catherine Ellison
John Canty

From: John Coakley John Coakley

I am writing this memorandum for the record.

Somewhat to my surprise a few days ago I had occasion to note that a prospective ninth grader who was a white resident of District V was being assigned out of District V for 1983-84. I asked for a "run" by RMU and to my amazement 45 white students (who had no "present school" rights, invitations to the Exam Schools, Wheatley to Copley rights, or bilingual/special needs) were so assigned: 3 to Brighton Vocational Education, 4 to Hyde Park Vocational Education, 5 to East Boston Business Education, 9 to Boston, 14 to English and 10 to Madison. Twenty of the students lived in Burke geocodes, 25 in Dorchester geocodes.

All had very high (i.e., very poor) random numbers in keeping with the program directions. Jack Yessayan and I believe that certain citywide schools and programs were so in need of white students that the computer scraped the bottom of the lottery barrel.

The assignment oddity is likely to be noticed if for no other reason than two of the 45 students already were in the Burke School and three already were in Dorchester High School.

Almost all the students were prospective ninth-grade students. The fortunate side of the oddity is that it eases the concern some of us have about equity for white residents of District V. The unfortunate aspect is that Burke's ninth grade is limited now to 88 students. The Headmaster thinks -- and I do not disagree -- that such a number is a setback which will bring staffing and morale problems as well as problems of public perception.

ab
xc: ✓Charles Glenn
Robert Dentler

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT
SCHOOL OPERATIONS
ROBERT S. PETERKIN

Copies to ✓ C. Glenn
+ CE, LF, JCa. + Pct Mgr.

MEMORANDUM

To: Robert R. Spillane, Superintendent

From: Robert S. Peterkin, Deputy Superintendent, School Operations RP

Date: May 3, 1983

Re: Dorchester High and Burke High Schools

Please be advised that I convened a meeting of the following persons to discuss the status of Burke and Dorchester High Schools for 1983-84:

Deputy Superintendent Oliver Lancaster, Deputy Superintendent Rosemarie Rosen, Director James Caradonio, Senior Officer John Coakley, Community Superintendent Mildred Griffith, Headmaster Albert Holland, Headmaster Stanley Swartz. The agenda for this meeting was to allow the Headmasters to discuss, a) general directions, b) program, c) budget, d) personnel, e) building renovations, and f) concerns. The goal was to have central administrators respond to these concerns, make final decisions and/or accept assignments for resolution of issues at these two high schools.

DORCHESTER HIGH SCHOOL -

Dorchester High School is conscientiously pursuing its Health Careers Magnet Program in the collaborative effort with HHORC. Stan Swartz feels that he has the shell of the program and is thankful for the cooperation of Mr. Caradonio and his staff. However, he expressed the following concerns:

a) money for planning
b) two coordinators for the Health Careers Magnet
c) knowlege of the extent of their percentage of the supplemental budget
d) administrative cutbacks
e) renovation

With respect to those needs the following responsibilities have been established:

26 COURT STREET, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108 • 726-6200 EXT. 5330 AREA 617

a) Peterkin and Griffith will provide the necessary funding to allow Dorchester High School to continue their planning for the Health Careers Magnet.

b) Rosen will facilitate the posting and rating of the clinical coordinator and program coordinator positions for the Health Careers Magnet and will allow them to be placed during this academic year to direct the planning effort.

c) Rosen will allow the retention of the second Assistant Headmaster and the Master in Charge of the Satellite Building in the Dorchester budget, in anticipation of a supplemental budget. Swartz agrees to trade off a registrar's position for this assurance until a supplemental budget is forthcoming.

d) Swartz indicates that his planning for ROTC is now a reality and that he may return for permission to enter into this program in the fall.

e) Peterkin and Coakley take the responsbility for working with the Superintendent preparing assurances for the School Building Assistance Bureau so that bids may be released for the renovation of Dorchester High School.

f) Coakley and Swartz take the responsibility for recruitment efforts and potential reassignments to provide adequate student numbers for the Health Careers Magnet Program.

BURKE HIGH SCHOOL

Burke High School will continue to pursue a computer magnet as its theme. Burke recently won a second round of computers and will add another room for that purpose within the high school. Mr. Caradonio has been extremely helpful in this effort and supports the magnet theme for Burke High School.

The following issues were brought to resolution concerning the Burke.

a. Rosen will add a second Assistant Headmaster and one Housemaster to the budget for the Burke School in anticipation of supplemental funding. When supplemental funding is a reality an additional Housemaster may be added.

b. Peterkin will transfer one position from the Department of Safety Services to cover Mr. Charles Drummer. This coverage will allow Joseph Day to assume an administrative position in Mr. Holland's administration as he currently does.

c. Rosen agrees to study the possibility of restoring one Social Studies teaching position at the Burke in anticipation of supplmental funding.

d. Peterkin agrees to transfer funding to the Burke for summer planning.

e. Rosen agrees to allow both Burke and Dorchester High Schools to order essential equipment and hardware during this fiscal year.

f. Swartz and Holland agree to submit the equipment list within a week.

g. Peterkin and Coakley agree to assist the Superintendent in assuring the SBAD that Burke High School has a long-term future. In addition Coakley will determine the contents of the bid specification for the Burke.

h. Rosen agrees to intercede on behalf of Burke with the Personnel Office with respect to the possible retention of teachers. (This also goes for Dorchester High School).

I feel that this meeting was extremely profitable in that the senior administration, district superintendent and local school administrators came to agreement on the future of these two high schools. Unlike last year we now have two identifiable thematic programs at these schools with adequate organizational and administrative support.

I look forward to many gains being made in addition to those already made this year.

If you have further questions please call me.

RSP:hkl

copy: Oliver Lancaster
Rosemarie Rosen
James Caradonio
✓John Coakley
Mildred Griffith
Al Holland
Stan Swartz

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
John R. Coakley, Senior Officer

April 8, 1983

Mr. Charles Glenn
Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education
1385 Hancock Street
Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

Dear Charles:

I am responding to your March 24th memorandum, 1983 Student Assignments. You raised three sets of questions, and I will try to comment on each set.

#1. We process "New-to-Boston" applications at the same time we process the applications of our own (K to grade 11) students. During the assignment period it has not been our practice to distinguish between the two kinds of applications. Of course, the rules programmed into our computer give "present school" guarantees to many of our current students, and such guarantees cannot be given to new applicants. On the other hand, the "community district school" rights for kindergarten through grade eight apply equally to current students and prospective students.

Each winter I provide the school system with projected enrollments for the following mid December, but, such enrollments are not made on a racial basis, nor are they intended to be goals. We do not attempt to set enrollment goals for each school during the Assignment Process.

At assignment time we adhere faithfully (some would say "rigidly") to programmatic and grade-by-grade capacities (which are refinements of the Space Matrix) in magnet elementary and middle schools, and such capacities or sub-capacities will be determined by race, except for Bilingual Education and Substantially Separate Special Education. John Canty and Carl Nickerson develop these sub-capacities which are "translated" by Jack Yessayan of Record Management Unit (you may recall one of the Advanced Work working printouts).

Given the "present school" or "community district school" rights of students, we do not set regular-education sub-capacities by grade or by race in the elementary and middle schools of the community districts. Thus far, we seldom encounter overcrowding but can encounter desegregation issues. However, I need not dwell on the mathematical problems of computing racial/ethnic percentage goals for a district based on the public school residents of a district, including the District IX attendees.

At the high school level, we set capacities and sub-capacities and adhere faithfully to them at Umana, Copley and Boston High Schools and, last year, at English and Madison Park High Schools. However, the complexity of attaining desegregation at the latter two schools and seeking it at all of the community district high schools sometimes require our going over capacities. (Dr. Dentler, I am certain, will attest to my claim.) Almost certainly we will exceed the Court Capacity of West Roxbury High School and possibly at Brighton High School. We will not reach capacity at East Boston High School and predictably will not reach capacity at Charlestown, Burke and Dorchester High Schools.

Relative to non-promotions, we do not factor in non-promotions. We "promote" everyone at assignment-time, then "de-promote" some students on July 1st and re-assign a portion of those students who presently are in grades 5 or 8, and then "re-promote" some of the "de-promoted" students before Labor Day (and "re-assign" any of such transitional grade students to their Assignment (i.e., May 1st) schools. The process, detailed in an administrative notice, was presented originally to the Experts and accepted by them, possibly with a lack of enthusiasm (although with no counter-recommendation either). Although the gross number of non-promotions is similar from year to year, the variation from school to school each year can be great. For example, a new principal can "change" the results or a collective "assault" on standards can alter the results. Further, some schools "fail" students in June and, even when students do not go to summer school, reconsider their decisions in September or even in December.

The above response may not seem responsive to you; it explains my tardiness in replying to you. We follow the Court-approved procedures which I have excerpted and enclosed. (The excerpt does not speak to Court-ordered priorities/guarantees or recent commitments on Dorchester/Burke High Schools.) If we do not like the results, particularly at the high school level, we may alter sub-capacities or use high-low racial ranges (rather than ideal racial goals) to obtain different results--usually ones with better racial/ethnic percentages, although sometimes at the expense of Court Capacities. In essence, we may spend up to a week, after the first results, analyzing, modifying and doing further "runs" before we make a presentation to you.

#2. Candidly, I do not think the outreach efforts at Dorchester and Burke High Schools will be dramatically better. (Also, I cannot at this time state what efforts were made at the two schools. I can tell you of our own citywide efforts and of my directives to school-level officals.) The schools ARE better this year AND the leaders are really trying, but perceptions die slowly and demographic changes continue in the district. Please compare:

Initial Assignments (Court Approved) of 1982-83 6/4/82

	Black	White	Other
Burke High	78%	13%	9%
Dorchester High	73%	16%	11%

Current Assignments in 1982-83 3/24/83

	Black	White	Other
Burke High	82%	10%	8%
Dorchester High	74%	14%	12%

Now, one may look at the comparison and think that the change has been minimal. However, I see regression because I can testify from personal knowledge, using your Bible and mine, that a total of one white student from District V--repeat, ONE--has been allowed to go to a high school other than Burke or Dorchester since June 6, 1982. I, personally, have examined every assignment or transfer request for District V residents this year, and have granted one medical ("traumatic") assignment to Madison Park High School.

I personally assured Judge Garrity in chamber that the June 6th assignments to Burke and Dorchester for 1982-83 were such that:

- no new white students from District V were assigned to Umana, Boston, English, Madison or the Vocational/Business Educational Programs except the Vocational Education Program at Dorchester High School itself, and
- no new white students from District V except the Wheatley 8th graders were assigned to Copley.

I repeat to you that since June 6, 1982 no white student from District V, except the one noted above, received an assignment other than Burke or Dorchester or received a transfer out of the two schools. Now, there were a small number of late acceptances to Technical High School and there may have been a few "readmitted" students (to other schools) who, by a five-year practice, are assigned to their last school of attendance if they attended it within two years. (Ironically, the purpose of that practices is to discourage a student who for example, otherwise might drop out of English High School and a month or so later try to gain entrance to West Roxbury High School.) Despite the usual pressures, we adhered strictly to our commitment. An independent auditor, with computer expertise, could verify what we did.

The point of this litany is to tell you not to expect too much on racial improvements at the two schools. Primarily, it is a "problem" of continuing in-migration of minorities, but Dorchester still is experiencing white out-migration. Relative to other schools, I am of the view that the Court considers them in compliance. We do everything possible to obtain the goals for each school within the requirements of the Court Orders and without indulging in false advertising (i.e., offering options we have no intention to even consider). The Court Order of 1975 and the later actions of the Court and Experts clearly obliged us to articulate to parents the many details of the Assignment Plan, including options and preferences. Although, we could not make promises that every applicant would receive a preferred school, it seems to me that we had the legal, ethical and moral obligation to consider the preferences. See page 71 of the 1975 Court Order: "The admission process will attempt to honor these indicated preferences." Some learned philosopher, theologian or psychiatrist will have to tell me some day why I sometimes feel I have violated ethical standards in an attempt to carry out Court Orders flowing from the law of the land.

#3. You use the term "projected enrollments," and I don't know how to answer your first question in item #3. I will try to give you, BEFORE we complete the "assigned enrollments," a breakdown of PREFERENCES by order, grade and race. (If I also can obtain that data by "present school" BEFORE the fact I will do so, but that is not guaranteed.)

The chief anomalies will be the balancing of the priorities of Court Capacities and Racial Goals at the high school level.

Another need would predictably be some flexibility in assigning kindergarteners. For example, at Application Time we probably will be oversubscribed by white applicants to the James Curley Kindergarten and undersubscribed by minority applicants. We would propose to assign whites up to the "white capacity" for the program, assign available minority children to the Kindergarten and leave the empty seats for minority applicants only who will come in during the summer. This situation occurs at Ohrenberger, Guild and McKay Schools too. (Last year, we had registered only 2000 kindergarteners, 54% white, at Assignment Time; now the enrollment is 4500, 40% white.)

Each year we anticipate--not always correctly--what will be asked of us, and we're usually prepared to tell the Court Expert or you what the realities were/are for schools such as the Stone, Lewis, Thompson. It might help if you and I agreed beforehand on possible schools of concern.

If you would like to meet I'd be glad to do so.

Sincerely,

John Coakley

John R. Coakley

Enclosure
cc: Franklin Banks

Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

April 5, 1983

Mr. John Coakley
Boston Public Schools
26 Court Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Dear Mr. Coakley:

I have reviewed the extensive material available to us bearing upon "special desegregation" measures at Burke and Dorchester High Schools. It seems to me that Superintendent Spillane's May 27th 1982 memorandum to Marshall Simonds represents as definitive a statement as is available on what the School Department has voluntarily agreed to do. Unless you have a better suggestion, we will use this memorandum as the basis for our monitoring efforts.

Let me suggest that the responsible administrators prepare a status report on administrative approvals, staffing arrangments, program changes, and recruitment efforts. In effect, this would involve simply a summary and interpretation of the monthly updates which have been developed in recent months, in relation to the May 1982 commitments.

Such a status report would serve not only the monitoring process but also the expected review, in May or June, of plans for renovation with state reimbursement.

In addition to the status of ongoing efforts, I would appreciate your goals for 1983 assignments to the two schools. How many applications from white students are received this Spring by comparison with 1981 and 1982? Are white students from District V being assigned to other non-examination schools?

I have asked Michael Alves to arrange to visit the two schools over the next month, with a representative of the Department of Implementation.

Cordially,

Charles Glenn

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT
ROBERT R. SPILLANE

May 27, 1982

MEMORANDUM

TO: Marshall Simonds, Esquire

FROM: Robert R. Spillane, Superintendent

SUBJECT: Burke and Dorchester High Schools

In the March 25, 1982 filing with the U.S. District Court on district level recommendations for the Burke and Dorchester high schools, you indicated that I would authorize the filing of a specific programmatic and staffing plan for the two schools after the Deputy Superintendents and other Senior Staff reviewed previously filed materials with staff from Community District V and the two high schools.

The purpose of this memorandum is to complete the filing with respect to those schools, and it includes information with regard to:

1. additional staffing that will be provided at each of the two schools in 1982-1983 in order to address programmatic improvements;
2. technical and programmatic assistance that shall be provided to the Burke and Dorchester high schools by James Caradonio, Director of the Humphrey Occupational Resource Center, and his staff; and
3. facilities improvements being sought at each of the schools.

Please be apprised that the program will be essentially as indicated in the submission of March 24, 1982 with only Attachment A as an addendum to the thematic offerings at Dorchester High School. Most of the work that has been done since the previous filing has addressed the linking of staffing to the programs that have been proposed at the two schools. Deputy Superintendent Peterkin has worked closely with the Community Superintendent and members of the high school staffs to ensure that proposed additional staff realistically addressed the thematic uniquenesses of the program offerings. The supplementary staffing would be as follows:

Burke High School

2 Reading teachers
2 Math teachers
1 English teacher
1 Social Studies teacher
1 Business teacher
1 Photography teacher
1 Music teacher
1 Assistant headmaster

Dorchester High School

1 Math teacher
1 English teacher
1 Social Studies teacher
1 Reading teacher
1 ROTC teacher
1 Vocal Music teacher
1 Typing teacher
1 Science/Chemistry teacher

In addition, it should be noted that in the past two months, James Caradonio and members of his staff at the Humphrey Center have worked closely with staffs of both schools to assist in the development of the career, education and occupational skill aspects of each of the programs (see Attachment B), Mr. Caradonio and his staff have done a thorough analysis of the technical assistance which can be provided to Burke and Dorchester high schools by the Humphrey Occupational Resource Center (see Attachment C). Mr. Caradonio's assistance will prove invaluable to strengthening new programs at the school and the general relationship between ORC and the two schools.

With regard to improvements of the facilities at each of the two schools, the Department of Planning and Engineering of the Boston Public Schools has completed the preliminary drawings and other technical documentation required for State Board approval. These submissions will be filed by June 1, 1982, and it is expected that State Board approval will be given at its June meeting.

The renovation projects finally included in the proposal of the state are identified in Attachments D and E. Roofing and pointing contracts will be advertised for bids on or about June 8, 1982, although contract awards cannot be made until after State Board approval and funding is guaranteed.

The city administration has conditioned its commitment to borrow funds for the approximately $3 million combined facility renovations on enactment of the so-called "Tregor Bill" or presumably some substantially similar legislation. As of this writing, the Governor reportedly intends to veto this legislation.

If this occurs, and the veto is not overridden or substantially similar legislation enacted, the renovation of the Burke and Dorchester high schools as proposed will have to be held in abeyance until funding is secured.

It is vital that the School Department take all necessary steps to improve the two schools. In that regard, I will be strenghthening the administration at each of the schools, and will have the Deputy Superintendent for Finance and Administration and the Office of Personnel Management work with the Community Superintendent and the Headmasters in regard to procedures that will allow greater flexibility in the selection and retention of staff. In addition, I have forwarded requests for curriculum development overtime for task forces of teachers, parents and students to begin work immediately to structure the program for 1982-1983 to the curriculum and staffing changes that are being proposed.

We have committed $500,000 in the 1983 budget to implement the plan presented here. The court should be apprised that while we have specified positions to staff the programs called for in the plan, their implementation may call for a reallocation within the $500,000 to provide for the appropriate combination of position, equipment and supplies and staff development expenses.

The Department of Implementation has just completed the student assignments and has indicated that the ninth grade enrollments are in compliance at each of the two schools. The Department of Implementation will be working with the Community Superintendent and Headmasters to further enhance the enrollments of each school.

Finally, I am forming a work group made up of each of the three Deputy Superintendents, the Manager of the Institute for Professional Development, Mr. Caradonio, a representative of my office, and representatives of the Community District office and the schools as selected by members of the staffs. I will form this task force prior to the end of the school year and clearly indicate to them the importance that I attach to the success of these two schools and outline the specific types of support, assistance and results that can be expected.

mc

Attachments
cc: President and Members of the School Committee
R. Peterkin
R. Rosen
M. Griffith

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Analysis of 1983 Boston Student Assignments: Tobin School

The Tobin School deserves special analysis because of the decision by the Court, last Spring, to allow the school to function as a K-8 school "Pilot" school, despite severe misgivings, on the part of the Court's expert, about the impact of this innovation upon the overall desegregation plan. These misgivings, expressed in a memorandum dated April 26, 1982, were answered in part by John Coakley in memoranda dated April 29 and May 3, 1983. Mr. Coakley especially gave assurances that the effect of the pilot would not be to create non-compliance with the Court's standards at the Edison and Taft Middle Schools in the same district.

It was after considering the positions expressed that the Court agreed to approve the Tobin "pilot", with the proviso that the intermediate grades (6-8) would reflect the district permitted range at that level, rather than the elementary level.

Recently the proposal has been made that K-8 schools be established in each of the districts in Boston. One of Dr. Dentler's concerns, in opposing the Tobin pilot, had been its precedental effect and the unfeasibility of implementing a K-8 structure throughout the system; a May 3, 1982 "Supplemental Memorandum in Support of Motion to Reconsider Tobin Pilot Project Proposal," filed by attorneys for the School Committee, answers that concern in this fashion:

> "The reference to the 'implications for the system citywide' makes sense only if, as Dr. Dentler apparently assumes, the School Department intends to switch to a K-8 program system-wide and the Tobin pilot project constitutes merely the tip of the iceberg. However, as the affidavit of Deputy Superintendent Robert Peterkin and the memorandum from Superintendent Spillane make clear there are no plans now to implement a K-8 structure in any school other than the Tobin. The School

> Department is considering whether and where a change in grade structure might make educational and desegregational sense. No decision on this score has been made, however, and no decision is contemplated until the success or failure of the Tobin project is carefully evaluated." (pages 4f.)

Presumably, then (unless this language is disingenuous), it is of great importance to evaluate the impact of the Tobin experience upon desegregation and upon education for students in District I. We must assume that the Educational Planning Group has done so, and it is incumbent upon the State Board, as Court-appointed monitor, to do so as well.

What does the Tobin "pilot" consist of? The Tobin, like other elementary schools in Boston, serves kindergarten students from it's immediate neighborhood (the Mission Hill section of Roxbury), and students in grades 1-5 drawn from 28 "geocodes" or geographical areas within District I. Under the approved "pilot", the Tobin is allowed to draw students in grades 6-8 on a voluntary basis from any part of District I, subject to the requirement that these grades reflect the District middle school permitted range of racial/ethnic enrollment.

The primary educational benefit claimed for K-8 schools is the greater continuity of instruction possible, and especially the education of intermediate students in the relatively stable environment of an elementary school rather than the sometimes difficult atmosphere of a middle school. In particular, parents who expect their children to go on to one of the examination schools or to the Umana Technical school in grade seven might well be expected to prefer a sixth year in an elementary school to a one-year stay in a middle school.

That a K-8 structure _per se_ is not inconsistent with desegregation is clear from the use of that structure in the highly successful Cambridge desegregation plan, the proposed use of a mixed K-5, K-8 structure in the Lawrence desegregation plan, the phase-in of K-8 schools as part of the

Worcester desegregation plan, and the fact that virtually all elementary schools affected by the Chicago Desegregation Plan are K-8. Brookline, with its large Metco program, also uses the K-8 structure.

A survey of Worcester parents (February 1982) conducted with state desegregation funds, found that 37% of 6140 parents responding expressed a first preference for the K-8, 9-12 structure by comparison with only 12% for the K-5, 6-8, 9-12 structure now employed in Boston; it should be noted that neither is the general structure in Worcester at present. Parents whose children are now in K-8 schools in Worcester supported that structure 48% to 5% for the K-5, 6-8, 9-12 structure.

My own view is that the K-8 structure is preferable for many students, though others will benefit from moving out of the atmosphere of an elementary school into that of a middle school. Increasingly it seems to me that grade structure itself may be one of the "options" which should be offered as part of a desegregation plan with major voluntary elements, subject always to avoiding the sort of "dual grade structure" by which Boston channeled students to predominantly Black and predominantly white high schools prior to desegregation. Since it was I who coordinated the planning which made the K-5, 6-8, 9-12 structure standard in Boston in 1974, I do not make this concession lightly.

This is only to say that the K-8 structure deserves to be considered on its merits as it operates in practice, and not be dismissed by an a priori conclusion that it will undercut desegregation. The Tobin School pilot, then, deserves such close attention.

The general problem with the K-8 structure with respect to desegregation is that a school can accommodate fewer students at each grade level than if there are fewer grades in the school. The rationale behind building the large elementary schools in Boston (funded with state desegregation funds starting with the mid-1960s) was to bring together white and minority students from a wide area and thus to achieve racial balance.

Increasing the number of grades in such a school shrinks the area from which students may be assigned, and thus the "safety margin" for stable desegregation. By drawing intermediate students on a voluntary basis, however, the Tobin disarms this particular concern.

In so doing, however, the Tobin creates a new concern, addressed by Dr. Dentler: such "magnet" elements may have a negative effect on the non-magnet schools at the same grade level (the Edison and the Taft, in this case), and they may also compete with the "official" magnet schools in District IX. While the special circumstances of the Tobin make it easy to dismiss this concern, it is fair to point out that the problem could appear much more clearly in other instances.

In fact, the Tobin deserves all of the help which it can be given to attract a white enrollment consistent with the Court's requirements, and it seems unlikely that it would ever draw too many white students out of the Taft and Edison. Tobin is located at the edge of the second largest public housing development in Boston, almost entirely Hispanic and Black, while Taft and Edison are located in predominantly-white Brighton. The only magnet elementary school in District I, the Jackson/Mann, is also located in Allston/Brighton, and enrolls very few Hispanic students (3%). It seems likely that white students who would go several miles to attend the Tobin on a voluntary basis for the 6th grade would go equally easily to the Wheatley or Mackey magnet middle schools, at little greater distance. In short, the Tobin's magnet elements are unlikely to injure desegregation at the district middle schools or at the existing magnet schools.

This is not to say, however, that situations could not arise in other districts which would have the negative effect suggested by Dr. Dentler. A K-8 structure at the Condon School in South Boston, for example, or at the Murphy School in Dorchester or the Kent School in Charlestown, for example, could draw white students from district middle schools in predominantly-minority areas, or from magnet middle schools. The Tobin, as it happens, is an especially appropriate school in which to try the experiment, but no hasty conclusions should be drawn from any success there.

IMPACT ON THE TOBIN SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

One of the more notable effects of the K-8 "pilot" at the Tobin is its apparent effect on first grade white enrollment in the school. The current first grade (students entering in September 1982, when the grade 6-8 pilot was implemented has 12 white students, of whom 11 are transported to the school from some distance. This compares with 7 in the second grade, three in the third, and two in the fourth. It may be that white parents are encouraged to send their children to their "geocoded" school because of the assurance that they will remain there through the eighth grade, as well as because of the magnet elements developed for the school.

Another way of stating this effect on the current first grade is to note that the projected September 1883 second grade will have 15 white students, representing 15% of projected second grade enrollment. Compare this with the District I projected enrollment for second grade of 16% white and it is clear that the Tobin is holding its own, at that level, with elementary schools in predominantly white areas. By contrast, the projected third, fourth and fifth grades - classes which entered the Tobin before the "pilot" program was instituted, have much smaller proportions of white students than the district as a whole:

Projected 1983-4	Tobin	District	ratio
grade 2	15% white	16%	.97
grade 3	7%	15%	.48
grade 4	12%	22%	.53
grade 5	5%	21%	.24

The entering first grade at the Tobin is projected to have only 9 white students; perhaps more will be recruited, though the current kindergarten at the school also has only nine white students.

The permitted range for elementary enrollment in District I is from 14% to 24% white, with the "ideal" at 19%. The projected grade 1-5 enrollment is 11% (up slightly from 10% in 1982-83) white, with the first and second grades at 14% and 15%. Whether the positive trend can be attributed to the grades 6-8 pilot or not, it is clear that the school is moving toward compliance.

At grades 6-8 the permitted range for 1983-4 is 18% to 30% white, with the "ideal" at 24%. The projected enrollment in these grades at the Tobin is 26% white, with the sixth grade at 30%. The current middle school grades at the Tobin are 28% white (1982-3 permitted range is 19% to 31%).

Comparing the school with the district, the projected sixth grade "over-represents" white students, while the projected seventh and eighth are only slightly above the district proportions.

Projected 1983-4	Tobin	District	ratio
grade 6	30% white	20%	1.47
grade 7	21%	18%	1.16
grade 8	27%	26%	1.03

This may be considered a "margin of safety" in assigning students to a school in a heavily minority area, though it should be noted that students who have applied for voluntary assignments are likely to accept those assignments.

How many students did request assignments to the Tobin? Taking first choices alone into account, substantially more Black and Other Minority students requested the sixth, the seventh, and the eighth grades at the Tobin than have actually been assigned, while slightly fewer white students requested the Tobin as their first choice than have been assigned:

First choice 1983-4	Black	White	Other Minority
Requested 6th	14	7	44
assigned	5	9	16
Requested 7th	27	8	26
assigned	13	8	17
Requested 8th	24	8	20

assigned	11	10	16

After less than a year in operation, the Tobin has established itself as an attractive option for students in District I. It might be noted, however, that virtually all of the white students who requested the Tobin are currently attending the school, with one first choice applicant from the Baldwin and one from the Winship for the sixth grade at the Tobin, for example. This suggests that fears that the Tobin would bring the Taft or Edison out of compliance were ill-founded; it also suggests that the school is not yet perceived as a "middle school" option for white students from other elementary schools.

Of equal interest is the substantial number of Black students presently attending the Edison or the Taft who requested the Tobin for the seventh or eighth grade: twenty for the seventh and sixteen for the eighth. To what extent is this a "neighborhood school" preference (though the immediate vicinity of the school is more Hispanic than Black), and to what extent a reflection on the experience of these students at the Edison or Taft? It would be useful to know . . .

Taking into account the students who expressed a second or third preference for the Tobin (see Table I), there were 57 Black students and 116 other minority students who expressed interest in the school for grades six through eight who could not be accommodated. While an unknown number of these students may have received another of their preferences, it is a matter of some concern that many students are being offered an opportunity which in fact they will not be able to take advantage of. It might be, for example, that minority students should be eligible only coming out of the fifth grade at the Tobin School, with white students eligible district-wide, to reduce the number of students disappointed.

Since most of the other minority applicants are seeking admission to a bilingual program offered at the Tobin in grades 6-8, it may be that the program should extend only to grade 5, as was the case until this year. With a projected 150 students (including 30 in grades 6-8), the Tobin will have the second-largest bilingual program in Boston at any level, amounting to 32% of total enrollment. In view of the fact that both Edison and Taft offer Spanish bilingual programs and, as pointed out recently by Attorney Alan Rom, the enrollment at each middle school is below the 30 students called for by the Lau Plan, it seems questionable to offer a third program for grades 6-8 at the Tobin. As we have seen, the primary result of offering this program is to disappoint far more students than can in fact be accommodated at the Tobin.

IMPACT ON OTHER MIDDLE SCHOOLS

In the last columns of Table II I present the projected white enrollments of the Edison and Taft Middle Schools, the schools with which grades 6-8 at the Tobin are directly "competing". Is there any sign that the desegregation of these schools is threatened? The question is really two-fold: do a sufficient number of Black and Hispanic students continue to come from the area where the Tobin is located to attend the Edison and the Taft, and do enough white students remain at the latter schools to ensure desegregation?

In his memorandum of April 29, 1982 John Coakley presents the potential "worst case" impact of the Tobin upon two middle schools, and concludes that the number of students who would be enrolled at the Tobin would in no case result in non-compliance at the Edison or Taft. What in fact is the projected extent of compliance with the Court's guidelines for the two schools, and is there any sign that the Tobin has caused problems?

Black	Percent	Range	Ideal	Deviation
Edison	28%	21-35%	28%	0.0
Taft	32%	21-35%	28%	0.14
White				
Edison	21%	18-30%	24%	-0.11
Taft	21%	18-30%	24%	-0.12

Other Minority				
Edison	50%	36-60%	48%	0.04
Taft	47%	36-60%	48%	-0.02

Since the Court allows a deviation of 25% plus or minus the "ideal", it i clear that the Edison and Taft remain squarely within the desegregation requiements for all three racial/ethnic categories. There is one distortion concealed within these aggregates, though it does not involve a violation of Court requirements: the Tobin has no Oriental students in grades 6-8, though the district is 18% Oriental at that level.

	% Oriental	% Hispanic
Tobin	0%	47%
Edison	23%	27%
Taft	15%	32%

Presumably this enrollment pattern was necessary to accommodate the Spanish bilingual program for grades 6-8 at the Tobin, together with Hispanic students who are not in the program.

As columns F-H in Table II indicate, the Tobin over-enrolls white students in grades 6-8 by comparison with the district, though not (as shown by columns Y-AD) to the extent of bringing Edison and Taft out of compliance. It appears, in fact, that the newly-assigned sixth grade at the latter schools will have a higher proportion of white students than the projected seventh grade; the April 1983 Taft enrollment, in fact, shows a present sixth grade out of compliance with the permitted range for white enrollment (17% compared with 19-32%). White enrollment district-wide may in fact be on the up-swing in those grades (projected first and second and projected sixth) where one might expect such an affect from successful implementation of the "magnet" approach at the Tobin School, if this has the effect of keeping more white students in the public schools.

CONCLUSIONS

To judge by enrollment (and we will be making an on-site assessment of the "magnet" educational program), the Tobin pilot K-8 grade structure may be judged a success. Not only have grades 6-8 attracted an enrollment which meet the Court's requirements, but there is an apparent improvement in the composition of the entering grades. The experience in Worcester and other cities, that parents appreciate the continuity offered by a K-8 school, seems to be confirmed - though in a very preliminary way - at the Tobin.

In addition, it does not appear that the desegregation of the Edison and Taft has been adversely affected by the implementation of grades 6-8 at the Tobin, and we have seen that there is no reason to believe that city-wide magnet schools will find the Tobin damaging competition.

On the other hand, the "success" of the Tobin should not be generalized into a conclusion that K-8 schools could be created indiscriminately, with no damage to desegregation. Each potential K-8 school should be considered in its context of district, neighborhoods, and other schools. It would appear, for example, that the seriously under-utilized Lee School in Dorchester might serve as an appropriate K-8 school, in a section of the city with few magnet schools (the Haley in Roslindale, the Ohrenberger in West Roxbury). Even in this case the potential impact upon the under-utilized middle schools in District III would have to be taken into account.

Finally, we have noted the fact (not necessarily a problem) that the Tobin attracts white students almost exclusively from its own enrollment, while encouraging far more applications from minority students attending other District I schools than could be accommodated. In particular, a large number of Hispanic students apply to the bilingual program in those grades at the Tobin, and I raised the question whether it is wise to offer this grade 6-8 program in competition with the under-enrolled Spanish bilingual programs at the Edison and Taft schools.

Explanation of Tobin School Tables

TABLE I

Information in this table is derived from three print-outs entitled "Student Tally by District by School by First (Second/Third) Preference by Race", dated 4/19 and 4/20/83. For each school in District I (except Brighton High School) the number of students expressing a first preference to attend the Tobin School magnet in grades 6-8, by race, is shown after the name of the school. Note that these figures include, under "other minority", many students expressing a preference for the Spanish bilingual program offered at the Tobin at those grade levels. The line "T Pref 1" summarizes the number of students, of each racial/ethnic group, expressing a first preference for the Tobin. The following line, "Assigned", shows the number of students actually assigned to the Tobin for September 1983, according to a print-out of proposed assignments dated 4/27/83. The following line shows the excess or short-fall of students choosing the Tobin less students who could be accommodated. The line labeled "Pref 2&3" shows the number of students, in all District 1 schools, who gave the Tobin as their second or third choice for grades 6-8, with the last line showing the cumulative excess or short-fall. So, for example, we learn that nine more Black students gave Tobin as their first choice for the sixth grade than could be accommodated, while an additional five gave it as their second or third choice, for a total excess of "volunteers" over students actually assigned of fourteen. Please note that those who expressed second or third choices may have obtained their first choices, so that we can say with confidence only that nine will be disappointed.

TABLE II

The data in this table includes a fairly complex analysis, so I have labeled the columns for ease of explanation. All data is from the print-out of proposed assignments, dated 4/27/83.

Column C	number of Black students assigned to the Tobin, by grade, followed (immediately below) by the percent which that represents of all students assigned at that grade level (thus, 17 Black students were assigned to the first grade, representing 27% of that grade's projected enrollment)
Column D	number of Black students projected for all schools in District 1 (including the Tobin) for each grade level, followed (immediately below) by the percent which that represents of all students projected for that grade level
Column E	Column C divided by Column D: the result represents, for the lines preceded by a grade level, the percent of all Black students in the district at that grade level who are assigned to attend the Tobin (thus, 20% of the Black students at grade 1 are assigned to the Tobin); in the alternate lines, the dividend represents an index expressing over (>1.0) or under (<1.0) representation of Black students in the Tobin (thus, Black students will be slightly over-represented in the seventh grade but slightly under-represented in the eighth grade at the Tobin)
Column F-N	the same information for White, Oriental (and Indian), and Hispanic students

Column O	total projected enrollment for each grade at the Tobin
Column P	total projected enrollment for each grade for District I
Column Q	percent of students at each grade level projected to attend the Tobin (thus, 17% of grade 1 enrollment but only 7% of grade 6 enrollment is projected to be at the Tobin)
Column R	the "ideal" proportion of Black students at each grade level for District I for 1983-84, according to the Court's March 24, 1982 Order
Column S	the projected deviation of the Tobin enrollment at each grade level from that "ideal", derived by subtracting the ideal percentage from the projected percentage and dividing by the ideal percentage (C-R/R), with >0.0 representing a projected percentage above the ideal, and <0.0 one below the ideal (thus, the second grade at Tobin is projected to be substantially above the ideal for Black enrollment, but the sixth grade substantially below the ideal
Columns T-W	the same information as R & S, for White and for Other Minority (Oriental, Indian, Hispanic) students
Column Y	projected white enrollment of the Edison Middle School, by grade
Column Z	projected percent white, by grade, at the Edison
Column AA	the projected deviation of white enrollment at the Tobin from the ideal white enrollment (24%) for grades 6-8 in District I (Z-T/T), expressed as described above under Column S
Columns AB-AD	the same information for the Taft Middle School

NOTE: this detailed information is presented to permit any observor to check my conclusions or to reach different conclusions, without the labor of data analysis

TABLE I (Tobin)

	Sixtn			Seventh		
	B	W	OM	B	W	OM
Edison				13	1	6
Taft				7	1	12
Baldwin	1	1	6			
Farragut	0	0	0			
Gardner	4	0	12			
Garfield	2	0	0			
Hamilton	0	0	0			
Tobin	4	5	20	7	6	8
Winship	3	1	6			
T Pref 1	14	7	44	27	8	26
Assigned	5	9	16	13	8	17
Diffrnce	9	-2	28	14	0	9
Pref 2&3	5	1	27	13	1	27
Diffrnce	14	-1	55	27	1	36

Eighth

	B	W	OM
Edison	11	0	3
Taft	5	0	8
Baldwin			
Farragut			
Gardner			
Garfield			
Hamilton			
Tobin	8	8	9
Winship			
T Pref 1	24	8	20
Assigned	11	10	16
Diffrnce	13	-2	4
Pref 2&3	13	1	21
Diffrnce	26	-1	25

TABLE II (Tobin)

B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Grade	Black			White		
	Tobin District			Tobin District		
K2	2	28	0.07	4	83	0.05
	0.05	0.13	0.37	0.10	0.40	0.25
1	17	84	0.20	9	96	0.09
	0.27	0.23	1.18	0.14	0.26	0.55
2	40	138	0.29	15	70	0.21
	0.40	0.31	1.32	0.15	0.16	0.97
3	21	92	0.23	5	52	0.10
	0.30	0.27	1.13	0.07	0.15	0.48
4	20	82	0.24	6	62	0.10
	0.39	0.29	1.34	0.12	0.22	0.53
5	14	74	0.19	2	59	0.03
	0.35	0.26	1.33	0.05	0.21	0.24
6	5	115	0.04	9	90	0.10
	0.17	0.26	0.64	0.30	0.20	1.47
7	13	114	0.11	8	65	0.12
	0.34	0.32	1.08	0.21	0.18	1.16
8	11	125	0.09	10	102	0.10
	0.30	0.32	0.93	0.27	0.26	1.03
Total	143	852	0.17	68	679	0.10
Percent	0.3[illegible]	0.27	1.12	0.15	0.22	0.67
Gr. 1-5	0.35			0.11		
Gr. 6-8	0.28			0.26		

306

	I	J	K	L	M	N
Grade	Oriental	Indian		Hispanic		
	Tobin	District		Tobin	District	
K2	1	45	0.02	34	54	0.63
	0.02	0.21	0.11	0.83	0.26	3.22
1	6	68	0.09	31	120	0.26
	0.10	0.18	0.52	0.49	0.33	1.51
2	11	91	0.12	33	151	0.22
	0.11	0.20	0.55	0.33	0.34	0.99
3	5	67	0.07	38	132	0.29
	0.07	0.20	0.37	0.55	0.38	1.43
4	2	55	0.04	23	81	0.28
	0.04	0.20	0.20	0.45	0.29	1.56
5	3	74	0.04	21	75	0.28
	0.08	0.26	0.29	0.53	0.27	1.97
6	0	96	0.00	16	140	0.11
	0.00	0.22	0.00	0.53	0.32	1.68
7	0	59	0.00	17	121	0.14
	0.00	0.16	0.00	0.45	0.34	1.33
8	0	55	0.00	16	107	0.15
	0.00	0.14	0.00	0.43	0.28	1.57
Total	28	610	0.05	229	981	0.23
Percent	0.06	0.20	0.31	0.49	0.31	1.56
Gr. 1-5	0.08			0.45		
Gr. 6-8	0			0.47		

	O	P	Q	R	S
Grade	Total			Black	Devia.
	Tobin	District		Ideal	
K2	41	210	0.20		
1	63	368	0.17	0.29	-0.07
2	99	450	0.22	0.29	0.39
3	69	343	0.20	0.29	0.05
4	51	280	0.18	0.29	0.35
5	40	282	0.14	0.29	0.21
6	30	441	0.07	0.28	-0.40
7	38	359	0.11	0.28	0.22
8	37	389	0.10	0.28	0.06
Total	468	3122	0.15		
Percent	1				
Gr. 1-5	322			0.29	0.20
Gr. 6-8	105			0.28	-0.01

X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC	AD
Grade	Edison (white)	Percent	Devia.	Taft (white)	Percent	Devia.
K2						
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6	39	0.20	-0.18	42	0.20	-0.18
7	31	0.19	-0.20	26	0.16	-0.32
8	46	0.25	0.02	46	0.28	0.16
Total						
Percent						
Gr. 1-5						
Gr. 6-8	116	0.21	-0.11	114	0.21	-0.12

Grade	T White Ideal	U Devia.	V Oth.Min. Ideal	W Devia.
K2				
1	0.19	-0.25	0.52	0.13
2	0.19	-0.20	0.52	-0.15
3	0.19	-0.62	0.52	0.20
4	0.19	-0.38	0.52	-0.06
5	0.19	-0.74	0.52	0.15
6	0.24	0.25	0.48	0.11
7	0.24	-0.12	0.48	-0.07
8	0.24	0.13	0.48	-0.10
Total				
Percent				
Gr. 1-5	0.19	-0.40	0.52	0.03
Gr. 6-8	0.24	0.07	0.48	-0.03

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
John R. Coakley, Senior Officer

Copies to CE, LT, Tlc
5/12
& to [illegible]

May 10, 1983

MEMORANDUM

To: Robert Spillane

From: John Coakley John Coakley

Subject: History of Tobin School Enrollments (Requested Report)

I. School Year 1981-82

A - Initial Assignments for 1981-82 (June 1981)

Grade	Black	White	Other	Total
Kindergarten	13	9	44	66
1 to 5	95	43	155	293
Total	108	52	199	359
Racial %s				
1 to 5	32%	15%	53%	

District I Goals (1981-82)	Black	White	Other
HIGH	38%	35%	53%
IDEAL	30%	28%	42%
LOW	22%	21%	31%

B - Mid-Year Enrollments for 1981-82 (December 1981)

Grade	Black	White	Other	Total
Kindergarten	39	12	76	127
1 to 5	114	35	155	304
Total	153	47	231	431
Racial %s				
1 to 5	37%	12%	51%	

C - Commentary for 1981-82

1. Except in District IX we assess racial desegregation in grades 1 to 5 only in the elementary schools.
2. The Tobin School was generally "low white" each year since 1975.

3. The Court usually assesses degree of compliance at Initial Assignment Time. It realizes that there is an ebb and flow of enrollments -- beyond our reasonable control -- during the school year.

4. Kindergarten enrollments in many schools are often low at the start and then build up through November. Even the vigorous publicity of March/April 1983 has not been able to break the pattern of late registration by parents.

II. School Year 1982-83

A - Initial Assignments for 1982-83 (June 1982)

Grade	Black	White	Other	Total
Kindergarten	1	6	28	35
1 to 5	87	28	199	314
6 to 8	Not approved until July/August 1982			
Total	88	34	227	349

Racial %s			
1 to 5	28%	9%	63%
6 to 8	See above		
Total (1 to 8)	Not possible		

District I Goals - Grades 1 to 5 (1982-83)

	Black	White	Other
High	36%	26%	63%
Ideal	29%	21%	50%
Low	22%	16%	37%

District I Goals - Grades 6 to 8 (1982-83)

	Black	White	Other
High	39%	31%	55%
Ideal	31%	25%	44%
Low	23%	19%	33%

B - Mid Year Enrollments for 1982-83 (December 1982)

Grade	Black	White	Other	Total
Kindergarten	17	9	61	87
1 to 5	105	30	167	302
6 to 8	22	18	25	65
Total	144	57	253	454

Racial %s			
1 to 5	35%	10%	55%
6 to 8	34%	28%	38%
Total (1 to 8)	35%	13%	52%

C - Commentary for 1982-83

1. By Court Order, desegregation was measured by grade level (i.e., 1 to 5, 6 to 8, 9 to 13) in 1982-83 rather than by the K to 13 yardstick.

2. The Court did not approve the Grade 6-8 assignments for the Tobin School until July/August 1982.
3. The Grade 6 to 8 capacity was set at 90 but the thrust of recruitment was at grades 6 and 7.
4. Students assigned to the K to 5 component of the Tobin School were assigned in accordance with standard procedures regarding geocoded designations for regular education and bilingual education students.
5. Students assigned to the 6 to 8 component all were volunteers who had responded to an inquiry sent to each District I resident/attendee of the appropriate grades.
6. The 6 to 8 enrollment was nearly perfectly desegregated.

III. School Year 1983-84

A - Proposed Initial Assignments for 1983-84 (April 1983)

Grade	Black	White	Other	Total
Kindergarten	4	4	35	43
1 to 5	110	37	173	320
6 to 8	29	27	49	105
Total	143	68	257	468

Racial %s			
1 to 5	34%	12%	54%
6 to 8	27%	26%	47%
Total (1 to 8)	33%	15%	52%

District I Goals - Grades 1 to 5 (1983-84)

	Black	White	Other
High	36%	24%	65%
Ideal	29%	19%	52%
Low	22%	14%	39%

District I Goals-Grades 6 to 8 (1983-84)

	Black	White	Other
High	35%	30%	60%
Ideal	28%	24%	48%
Low	21%	18%	18%

B - Commentary for 1983-84

1. The assigned enrollment for grades 6 to 8 is high in keeping with our practice of assigning sufficient numbers of students to voluntary programs in the Spring to compensate for the predictable fall-off by Labor Day.
2. These assignments have been approved by the Massachusetts Board of Education but, due to litigation, have not been authorized for distributuion to students.

3. Again, only volunteers are assigned to the grade 6 to 8 program. District I residents of appropriate grades had the option of the Tobin School, grade 6 to 8, on their applications. The assigned students were chosen by computerized lottery.

JC:ab

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Analysis of 1983 Boston Student Assignments: Special Desegregation Schools

Certain schools have been identified by the Court from time to time as subject to special desegregation requirements. We are preparing reports on East Boston High School and on Burke and Dorchester High Schools; in the Fall we plan to review measures taken at the three examination schools to provide support services to encourage and assist Black and Hispanic. Requirements for the bilingual program at Charlestown High School are being reviewed as part of the monitoring of bilingual programs in general (I have also prepared an analysis of the issue of "clustering" of high school programs). The Guild, Hennigan, Hale and McKay schools are discussed in the report on magnet elementary schools.

The "special desegregation" schools not identified above are the Ellis, Pauline Agassiz Shaw, Lee, Ellis and Emerson elementary schools and the Robert Gould Shaw and Thompson middle schools. These six schools are discussed in the present report.

PAULINE AGASSIZ SHAW

Enrollment in grades 1-5 in April 1983 was

	number	percent	permitted
Black	127	69%	54%-90%
White	50	27%	18%-30%
Other Min	6	4%	3%-5%

The school is therefore in compliance in all three racial/ethnic categories.

Projected enrollment in grades 1-5 for September 1983 is

	number	percent	permitted
Black	120	60%	55%-91%
White	72	36%	16%-28%
Other Min	7	4%	4%-6%

The white enrollment is projected to be too high, as pointed out in my memorandum on compliance with the Court's standards. It is reasonable to believe, however, that there will be a substantial fall-off of white students now attending District IV elementary schools and assigned to the Shaw for the Fall, as well as an increase in the number of Black students attending the school in the first grade, who were not available for assignment because they did not attend kindergarten. In any event, an excess of white enrollment at the Shaw cannot be considered undesirable, given the location of the school.

LEE

It was around the Lee School, in 1971, that a serious confrontation arose between the Board of Education and the School Committee over the latter's failure to follow through on the agreements under which the school had been built. John Coakley developed the new, desegregated district for the school which the School Committee would not implement fully, and it was I who advised the Board to find the Committee in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment because of the _de jure_ segregation of the Lee School which resulted. Out of this incident grew the decision, by Black Plaintiffs, to institute the _Morgan_ case. Small wonder, then, that the Lee has remained on the list of schools for special attention.

Current (April 1983) enrollment in grades 1-5 is:

	number	percent	permitted
Black	213	67%	46%-78%
White	75	24%	22%-38%
Other Min	28	9%	6%-10%

The school is in compliance at present.

Projected enrollment for September 1983 is:

	number	percent	permitted
Black	197	58%	46%-78%
White	111	33%	22%-36%
Other Min	29	9%	7%-11%

It is reasonable to expect a drop-off in white enrollment, since 62 white students are projected for first grade in comparison with 49 for grades 2-5. If the drop-off were drastic, reducing the entering class to ten white students (equivalent to the projected second grade), the school would be 21% white in September, or slightly below the permitted range. Clearly, then, it is important to make every effort to retain as many as possible of the assigned white students. The Lee School has enjoyed strong educational leadership, and it is to be hoped that in fact a substantial proportion of the assigned white students will be in attendance in the Fall as a result of the realization, by their parents, that the Lee can meet their educational needs.

ELLIS

The April 1983 enrollment of the Ellis, grades 1-5, was:

	number	percent	permitted
Black	162	46%	33%-55%
White	40	11%	17%-29%
Other Min	154	43%	25%-41%

The high other minority enrollment was the result of the presence of a large bilingual program, amounting to 120 Hispanic students; this is permitted by the Court. The white enrollment, on the other hand, was clearly below the permitted range. Since no elementary school in District II was above the permitted range for white students (the Manning was at the very outer edge with 29.3% white enrollment), the only remedy would seem to be to attract more white students into the public schools. Two front-page articles about "home schooling" in the local weekly during April 1983 suggest that the public schools need to reach out more vigorously to the community, as indeed several of the elementary schools have. The "beacon school" proposal of several years ago – suggested at least one approach to doing so, by breaking out of strict geocode limitations; the Board of Education had questions, however, about the selection of schools and the potential for inequities in the details of the proposal, and the Court did not approve its implementation.

The projected enrollment for September 1983 is:

	number	percent	permitted
Black	161	45%	32%-54%
White	71	20%	16%-26%
Other Min	128	36%	27%-45%

The dramatic improvement in projected enrollment is based upon the assignment of 40 white students to first grade (as much as the total K-5 white enrollment in April 1983). Again, white students are clearly available, since each of this is presumably in a kindergarten run by the public schools, but it is to be feared that the 1983-84 first grade will be nearer to the 4 white students of 1982-83 than to the projected 40! "Special desegregation measures must rely more upon convincing parents of the educational quality and the climate of the school than upon simply assigning students.

EMERSON

The Emerson and the Ellis are perhaps fifteen blocks apart in Roxbury, but the one draws white students from the far side of South Boston High School and the other from the far side of the Arnold Arboretum. The grade 1-5 enrollment of the Emerson in April 1983 was:

	number	percent	permitted
Black	62	45%	28%-46%
White	28	20%	29%-49%
Other Min	48	35%	18%-30%

The Emerson houses a Cape Verdean bilingual program (the students counted as Black), and is one of the few schools in Boston with a significant proportion

(9%) of American Indian students. It is located along Dudley Street, where rapid growth in Hispanic population is occurring.

The school has too few white students and too many Hispanic students to be in compliance with the permitted ranges.

The projected Fall 1983 enrollment is:

	number	percent	permitted
Black	52	41%	28%-46%
White	29	23%	28%-46%
Other Min	34	27%	19%-33%

The racial proportions improve largely because fewer Black and Hispanic students have been assigned to the first grade than are in the present first grade; unlike the schools discussed above, the Emerson is not assigned an unrealistically high number of white students! It could be that the school will be closer to compliance in the Fall, though there may be a significant number of minority students turning up for first grade who were not in kindergarten . . .

SHAW MIDDLE SCHOOL

The Shaw and the Thompson are discussed in my report on middle school assignments.

April 1983 enrollment of the Shaw was:

	number	percent	permitted
Black	234	71%	41%-69%
White	63	19%	28%-48%
Other Min	32	10	5%-9%

The school was slightly high in Black and other minority enrollment, and significantly low in white enrollment.

Projected Fall 1983 enrollment is:

	number	percent	permitted
Black	213	73%	42%-70%
White	52	18%	27%-45%
Other Min	27	10%	6%-10%

Obviously, there is no improvement. It might be noted, however, that the three middle schools in District III have a combined enrollment which is only 28% white (April 1983), at the very bottom of the "range".

THOMPSON MIDDLE SCHOOL

Enrollment of the Thompson in April 1983 was:

	number	percent	permitted
Black	369	82%	52%-88%
White	70	15%	20%-34%
Other Min	13	3%	2%-4%

The way the permitted range is computed (the "ideal" plus/minus 25%) has the effect of creating a very wide range if the "ideal" in any group is high. For example, if the "ideal" for each group were 33%, the range would be 25%-41%, or sixteen percentage points. When one group is as predominant as Black students are in District IV (in part because there are few "other minority" students), a very wide range is created - one which it would be hard to miss! The white range, by the same token, is a narrow and difficult one. All this by way of explaining why the Thompson is out of compliance on white enrollment (nine percentage points from the ideal) but in compliance on Black enrollment (twelve percentage points from the ideal).

The projected Fall 1983 enrollment is:

	number	percent	permitted
Black	347	79%	52%-88%
White	82	19%	20%-34%
Other Min	11	2%	2%-4%

The projections indicate significant progress, with twice as many white students in the sixth grade as in the seventh, and twice as many in the seventh as in the eighth. If those enrollments can be firmed up, the Thompson will be a real success story.

CONCLUSIONS

We have not made recent site visits to the six special desegregation schools discussed in this report, nor have we discussed with the Department of Implementation the strategies used to achieve the objectives of the desegregation plan. As we follow these schools in the Fall, it will be necessary to ask what is being done, especially by the elementary schools, to persuade parents whose children are assigned to these schools to give them a chance. It does appear that assignments - limited as their actual effect may be - are being used purposefully to achieve and stabilize the desegregation of these schools.

CG

Charles L. Glenn, Director
May 16th 1983

DRAFT

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Analysis of 1983 Boston Student Assignments: Other Minority Students

More than one third of the Other Minority students in Boston are assigned to bilingual programs:

Racial Category	In TBE Prog	Not in TBE	Total	% in TBE
"Oriental"*	1338	2273	3611	37%
Hispanic	3452	5217	8669	40%
Indian American	5	229	234	2%
Total	4795	7719	12514	38%

* corresponds to "Asian" in state and federal reports

(Note that an additional 1502 students in bilingual programs (incuding Haitian French, Italian, Portuguese, Cape Verdean, and Greek) are classified as "Black" or "white"; altogether there are 6297 students assigned to TBE programs for 1983-84, or 11% of system enrollment.)

It is difficult to assess desegregation assignments of other minority students, because of the priority given to bilingual program assignments, the need to cluster students in such programs for effective instuction (see the separate memorandum on this subject), and because other minority students are unevenly distributed among the geographical districts:

	Oriental	Hispanic	Indian
I	779	1199	13
II	46	1548	12
III	132	279	6
IV	24	89	15
V	57	984	23
VI	118	861	57
VII	1040	965	6
VIII	66	186	15
(IX)*	1294	2275	82
total	3611	8669	234

* draws students city-wide

One aspect of other minority student desegregation deserves special attention, however: the distribution of such students who are not in bilingual programs at the high school level. It was within recnt memory that Hispanic students began to be significantly represented in high schools, and a decade ago their drop-out rate was nearly 100%. The number of Oriental (including not only Chinese but an increasing number of Vietnamese, Cambodian, Lao and other Asian students) and Hispanic students at each high school provides significant information about the educational benefits available to such students.

To permit such an analysis, I have prepared a chart (attached) showing and analysing the number of Oriental and of Hispanic students at each high school in Boston. The chart has eight columns:

A	the number of Oriental students not in a bilingual class
B	the percent of all such students in grades 9-12 system-wide in each school
C & D	the same information for Hispanic students
E	the total enrollment grades 9-12 in each school
F	the percent of all students in grades 9-12 system-wide in each school
G	the over- or under-representation of Oriental students in each school (column B divided by column E)
H	the same information for Hispanic students

Note that this information is based upon the assigned enrollments for September 1983, as of April 1983.

To illustrate how this chart should be interpreted: Brighton High School enrolls 9% of the Oriental (non-TBE) students, but only 6% of all students; therefore, Oriental students are "over-represented" by 50%, as is shown by the index number (column G) 1.51. This result is nothing to be concerned about, since many Chinese and Southeast Asian students live in Brighton.

It is the city-wide schools (all those following East Boston on the chart) which might be expected to enroll other minority students in roughly comparable numbers; in fact, we see that Oriental and Hispanic students have sharply different enrollment patterns.

Oriental students are less than half the proportional numbers at Boston High, with its work-study program, and at English High, while they are even scarcer at Madison Park High (only 17% of the proportional number). On the other hand, Oriental students attend Latin Academy at double their numbers system-wide, Latin School at 2 1/2 times, and Boston Technical at nearly 3 1/2 times their proportional rate. Copley Square has almost the "ideal" number of Oriental students, while Umana Tech has substantially more than the proportional number.

Hispanic students, on the other hand, are strongly over-represented at Boston High and Madison Park, and somewhat over-represented at English, Copley Square, and Umana. They are under-represented at Technical (though note that the school also has a Spanish TBE program), at less than half the proportional numbers at Boston Latin, and at less than one third the proportional numbers at Latin Academy.

In short, it appears that Oriental students are taking full advantage of the more academic opportunities among the Boston high schools, in clear contrast with Hispanic students, who are concentrated in the district and general high schools. Fully 49% of non-TBE Oriental students attend the three examination schools, contrasted with 9% of Hispanic non-TBE students and 18% of all students grades 9-12.

It would be appropriate to review the educational opportunities - and outcomes - for Hispanic students who are not enrolled in TBE programs.

Charles Glenn
4-30-83

	A	B	C	D
SCHOOL	Oriental # in school	percent of system	Hispanic # in school	percent of system
Brighton	89	0.09	134	0.08
Jamaica Plain	4	0.00	159	0.10
West Roxbury	9	0.01	59	0.04
Hyde Park	3	0.00	18	0.01
J.E.Burke	6	0.01	39	0.02
Dorchester	3	0.00	30	0.02
South Boston	5	0.01	43	0.03
Charlestown	39	0.04	88	0.06
East Boston	21	0.02	35	0.02
Boston High	20	0.02	120	0.08
Latin Academy	86	0.09	21	0.01
Latin School	189	0.19	60	0.04
Tech	209	0.21	70	0.04
Copley Sq	27	0.03	66	0.04
English	40	0.04	192	0.12
Madison Park	16	0.02	271	0.17
Umana Tech	86	0.09	111	0.07
	852		1516	

E total enrollment	F percent of system	G under/over Oriental	H under/over Hispanic	SCHOOL
1073	0.06	1.62	1.51	Brighton
926	0.05	0.08	2.08	Jam Plair
1388	0.07	0.13	0.51	W Roxbury
995	0.05	0.06	0.22	Hyde Park
511	0.03	0.23	0.92	J.E.Burke
768	0.04	0.08	0.47	Dorchester
895	0.05	0.11	0.58	South Bos
855	0.04	0.89	1.24	Charlestown
1071	0.06	0.38	0.40	East Boston
813	0.04	0.48	1.78	Boston High
818	0.04	2.05	0.31	Latin Acad
1450	0.08	2.54	0.50	Latin Sch
1189	0.06	3.43	0.71	Tech
547	0.03	0.96	1.46	Copley Sq
1691	0.09	[illegible].46	1.37	English
1890	0.10	0.17	1.73	Madison Pk
1046	0.05	1.60	1.28	Umana Tech
17926				

John H. Lawson, Commissioner of Education

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

June 1, 1983

Dr. Robert R. Spillane
Superintendent of Schools
Boston Public Schools
26 Court Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Dear Dr. Spillane:

In view of our mutual concern to expedite the assignment process, I authorized Dr. Charles Glenn, in consultation with Dr. David Cronin, to approve the assignments to the Humphrey Occupational Resource Center for Fall 1983. He did so *via* telephone conversation with Mr. Coakley on May 24, after preparing a detailed written analysis for me.

While the assignments which have been made are consistent with the Court's guidelines with respect to race and ethnicity, only a more detailed analysis of *new* as distinguished from *continuing* applications and assignments will permit us to determine whether the procedures laid down in the 1975 Unified Plan have been fully complied with with respect to sex. In addition, we note that most of the programs are appropriately under-assigned to permit further recruitment of students whose participation will further compliance with the enrollment goals, and we trust that your staff are actively recruiting to fill these programs with the appropriate numbers of students of each racial/ethnic group and gender.

Our analysis will therefore continue, as will our monitoring of your ongoing efforts, and we will discuss HHH/ORC enrollment in detail in the July Monitoring Report.

Let me express my appreciation for the information which Mr. Coakley has been providing in support of the proposed assignments. I feel that we are developing a monitoring relationship based upon candor and concern for the central issues at stake.

Sincerely yours,

John H. Lawson

John H. Lawson
Commissioner of Education

JHL:ek

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Analysis of 1983 Boston Student Assignments: Occupational Resource Center

Students entering ninth grade in Boston are given the opportunity, as part of their assignment application, to express a desire to participate in an exploratory program at the Occupational Resource Center (ORC). This program is offered on a half-day basis for either the first or second semester.

Students entering grades ten, eleven, or twelve are given the opportunity to apply for up to three half-day skill training programs from among 35 provided in nine "clusters" by the ORC. Such students are also assigned to a high school for their academic program.

I have begun the process of reviewing proposed 1983-84 assignments, using material received on Friday May 20th. See the attached memorandum from Mr. Coakley for a description of the primary material; he also provided data on the first, second, and third preferences for ORC skill training programs. In addition, I have asked him to provide me with materials which he prepared in prior years, on the operational capacity of each skill training program and the negotiated "overage" for each (that is, the number of students which the ORC administration has agreed should be assigned to each program over the capacity for that program, to allow for shrinkage based upon past experience).

The controlling standards for assignments to the ORC are the "admissions criteria" found on pages 9-11 of the Unified Plan of September 3, 1975, which were drafted primarily by Attorney Sandra Lynch and me, as modified by the Court in the Spring of 1982 to exclude the enrollment of the examination schools from the city-wide enrollment standard for the ORC. I will restate the most important of these standards:

* students may be assigned to a program only voluntarily

* oversubscribed programs will be subject to random selection of applicants, provided that racial and male-female objectives are met thereby

* all programs "will reflect the racial ratios established by the Court for the city-wide schools" (modified as noted above, this means a range of 52%-60% Black, 18%-28% White, and 20%-22% Other Minority for 1983-84)

* "In those programs in which students of one sex have represented less than 35% of the enrollment of that program, the admission . . . shall specifically encourage a student composition . . . in keeping with the citywide male/female ratio."

* "Insufficient applications for a particular program from students of one race will result in the underenrollment of the program."

* If applications in appropriate racial proportions greatly exceed program capacity, consideration is to be given to expanding the program through use of out-of-school sites and training resources.

* "Admissions to each such employability skill program shall be made on the basis of equal numbers of male and female students, so far as the pool of applications filed permits."

* Students already enrolled are to be allowed to continue in programs "without regard to the racial or sexual composition of the enrollment of the second year of the program". While this provision applied to 1976, it states a principle which I assume is and should still be operative.

As will immediately be apparent, these requirements and the large number of programs make analysis of assignments a matter of great complexity. I have in fact concluded that I cannot make a complete analysis in time to permit assignments to be sent out by June 1st, the date set by the Unified Plan itself. There are two primary reasons:

(1) Close study of the information already provided makes it clear that I will need additional information on program capacities and on newly assigned students as distinguished from those already participating in each program; it is not reasonable to expect the School Department to prepare such information within a day or two.

(2) My own commitments this week - including the coordination of the July monitoring report - prevent my devoting more than a day to the ORC analysis. In addition, staff of the Division of Occupational Education should have the opportunity to correlate the assignment information with their own monitoring of the ORC on a program-by-program basis.

Fortunately, it is not necessary to carry out a complete analysis at this time. Mr. Coakley has given me two assurances as to process which I consider satisfactory, in conjunction with the analysis which I have been able to conduct. These assurances are:

(a) Twelve programs (of thirty-five) were left underenrolled because of desegregation considerations. That is, an insufficient number of white students (for example) applied to a program to permit all of the Black applicants to be assigned to the program, even though some space was left available. The fact that this occurred provides assurance that the admission requirements are being observed. I will be able to confirm this in detail when program capacity and new student information is available, but let me note those programs which are well below the permitted range in white assigned enrollment:

Retailing
Advanced Office
Banking
Medical Office Assistant
Nursing Assistant
Photo Technology

Machine
Dental Assistant
Health Aide

Commercial Design
Television Production

The only programs over the permitted range for white students were:

330

Carpentry Heating, Air Conditioning

Note that it is not possible to say whether the newly assigned students for each program comply with the permitted range or help to bring the program toward compliance. This form of analysis, which I was able to carry out in detail with school assignments, cannot be done for the ORC with the data now available to us.

(b) The assignment process gave preference to male or female students to the extent that was appropriate in order to correct past under-representation of either group. It appears that this aspect of the Unified Plan has not been monitored in recent years; it is unusual for a race desegregation plan to include such a provision, but Massachusetts law places an obligation upon school systems to take active efforts in this area. Last June, for example, the Board of Education approved a high school racial balance plan for Springfield which dealt explicitly with male/female enrollments. Several months ago I reminded Mr. Coakley of this requirement, and he has taken it into account in the assignment process and in the data provided to me.

The assignment projections show sixteen of the thirty-five skills programs underenrolling female students (taking 35% as the standard), and ten underenrolling male students; the programs are generally predictable. Mr. Coakley points out that second and third year students may account for much of this disparity, and also that racial considerations may have precluded assigning all of the female students expressing a preference for a particular program.

In the next to last column of my chart (marked "Pref") I show, for selected programs, the number of female students who expressed a willingness (first, second, or third preference) to enroll in the program. Only in electronics and TV production are those numbers large; it is of some concern that the projected enrollment for electronics is only 7.7% female, even making all allowances for the impact of race and of continuing students. Electronics has always seemed to me a field in which the usual arguments for "physical limitations" to employment of women are especially inapt.

6

In brief, then, Mr. Coakley's assurances and my own review of the available data suggest that the proposed assignments are generally consistent with the requirements of the Unified Plan, and that we should allow them to go ahead while we conduct more in-depth analysis. Such analysis will undoubtedly result in recommendations for improved recruitment and support for female students and white students in those ORC programs in which they are under-represented, and will perhaps raise questions about those programs which have demonstrated insufficient appeal.

The other reason I am comfortable about permitting assignments to go ahead at this time has to do with the nature of the ORC assignment process. It appears that twenty-seven of the thirty-five programs have available space either for additional students who may be encouraged to apply, or for additional students already on the waiting list if other students can be persuaded to apply so that desegregation requirements will be met. In other words, the assignment process will be far from complete when the proposed 2,247 students are assigned to skill training programs. Hundreds more may be assigned if successful recruitment is carried out, and thereby the racial and male/female goals may be more closely met.

This quick but intensive review of the problem of ORC assignments makes it clear that we will need to work with the Boston Public Schools over the months ahead, applying what has been learned through the annual admissions review process with selective vocational schools statewide. This is a field in which the Department has considerable resources of expertise among its staff, as well as models of successful school-level leadership to offer. No effort which we could make over the next year would have such an impact upon sex equity in Massachusetts and upon the life-chances of minority students as our assistance to the secondary desegregation plans in Boston and Springfield, and the Commissioner has already made this a priority in his 1983 Operational Plan.

The charts which I have prepared present the following information, drawn from the data provided me by Mr. Coakley last Friday:

for each program,

- o projected total enrollment
- o projected Black male enrollment
- o projected Black female enrollment
- o total projected Black enrollment
- o percent (stated as a decimal) Black in projected total enrollment
- o the same information for White and for Other Minority enrollment
- o total male enrollment
- o percent male in projected total enrollment
- o the same information for female enrollment
- o for selected programs, the number of first, second or third preferences by female students
- o short program description

Before stating my conclusions I must take note of a further issue on which I have not been able to satisfy myself: the assignment of "other minority" students, especially those requiring language support. The under-representation of such students in cabinetmaking, carpentry, plumbing and sheet metal is notable; they seem to have found a special niche in the dental assistant and banking programs. Overall other minority students are represented at the "ideal" of 21%, but with considerable variation among programs. The review by staff of the Greater Boston Regional Education Center shows that all limited English proficient students receiving vocational/occupational education programs are mainstreamed. The ORC, according to this report, has six bilingual paraprofessional aides to provide instructional support services and one bilingual counsellor for the 474 limited English proficient students (not, of course, all of one language group) enrolled in ORC programs in 1982-83. It should be a priority for the Department of Education to assure that language and counselling support are adequate to assure full participation by these students, for whom a good vocational program may be especially valuable.

CONCLUSION

I recommend that we approve the assignments for the ORC as presented last Friday, noting that we have not had the opportunity to satisfy ourselves that the desegregation of the ORC complies in all respects with the requirements of the Unified Plan, as modified to date. We should offer to work with the School Department over the course of the next year to strengthen the middle school and high school exploratory and guidance efforts with a view to achieving improved enrollments in each program which now is out of compliance. We should encourage the School Department to consider expanding or replicating those programs with a proven ability to draw a racially desegregated enrollment, and to assure that such programs also enroll appropriate representation of male and female students. We should give close attention to access and support for limited English proficient students in the programs of the ORC.

Charles L. Glenn, Director
May 23rd 1983

ORC page 8

PR	T	BM	BF	B		WM	WF	W	
A	126	52	34	86	.683	17	2	19	.151
B	43	13	19	32	.744	1	2	3	.070
C	86	45	10	55	.640	19	0	19	.221
D	106	52	5	57	.538	36	0	36	.340
E	70	38	1	39	.557	20	0	20	.286
F	43	24	1	25	.581	11	0	11	.256
G	91	51	2	53	.582	19	0	19	.209
H	22	10	5	15	.682	2	0	2	.091
I	37	16	9	25	.676	8	0	8	.216
J	48	26	1	27	.563	12	0	12	.25
K	54	11	29	40	.741	0	6	6	.111
L	46	2	22	24	.522	1	8	9	.196
M	18	5	1	6	.333	0	2	2	.111
N	62	8	26	34	.548	1	11	12	.194
O	29	6	11	17	.586	0	1	1	.034
P	67	6	28	34	.507	0	13	13	.194
Q	118	5	61	66	.559	0	24	24	.203
R	35	4	19	23	.657	0	7	7	.2

ORC page 9

OM	OF	O		M		F		Pref	
14	7	21	.167	83	.659	43	.341		Food
3	5	8	.186	17	.395	26	.605		Rtail
10	2	12	.140	74	.860	12	.140	14	Cabnt
13	0	13	.123	101	.953	5	.047	12	Carp
11	0	11	.157	69	.986	1	.014	3	Plumb
7	0	7	.163	42	.977	1	.023	2	Maint
16	3	19	.209	86	.945	5	.055	8	AuBdy
4	1	5	.227	16	.727	6	.273	3	Mach
4	0	4	.108	28	.757	9	.243	13	ShMet
8	1	9	.188	46	.958	2	.042	6	Weld
1	7	8	.148	12	.222	42	.778		Offce
1	12	13	.283	4	.087	42	.913		LegOf
2	8	10	.556	7	.389	11	.611		Dntl
4	12	16	.258	13	.210	49	.790		WrdPr
5	6	11	.379	11	.379	18	.621		Bank
1	19	20	.299	7	.104	60	.896		Child
0	28	28	.237	5	.042	113	.958		Cosm
2	3	5	.143	6	.171	29	.829		Fash

ORC page 10

PR	T	BM	BF	B		WM	WF	W	
S	21	7	6	13	.619	2	2	4	.190
~~T~~	~~159~~	~~49~~	~~43~~	~~92~~	~~.579~~	~~19~~	~~14~~	~~33~~	~~.208~~
U	14	2	8	10	.714	0	1	1	.071
V	23	4	11	15	.652	2	2	4	.174
~~W~~	~~68~~	~~5~~	~~41~~	~~46~~	~~.676~~	~~0~~	~~6~~	~~6~~	~~.088~~
X	66	4	41	45	.682	0	9	9	.136
Y	110	54	4	58	.527	26	0	26	.236
~~Z~~	~~183~~	~~103~~	~~13~~	~~116~~	~~.634~~	~~27~~	~~1~~	~~28~~	~~.153~~
1	8	2	0	2	.25	3	0	3	.375
2	18	11	1	12	.667	0	2	2	.111
~~3~~	~~14~~	~~3~~	~~6~~	~~9~~	~~.643~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~5~~	~~.357~~
4	35	16	1	17	.486	7	1	8	.229
5	54	18	20	38	.704	3	2	5	.093
~~6~~	~~76~~	~~24~~	~~23~~	~~47~~	~~.618~~	~~10~~	~~5~~	~~15~~	~~.197~~
7	47	27	8	35	.745	4	0	4	.085
8	197	104	0	104	.528	40	1	41	.208
~~9~~	~~53~~	~~27~~	~~0~~	~~27~~	~~.509~~	~~14~~	~~0~~	~~14~~	~~.264~~
	2247	834	510	1344	.598	306	125	431	.192

ORC page 11

OM	OF	O		M		F		Pref	
2	2	4	.190	11	.524	10	.476		Hotel
21	13	34	.214	89	.560	70	.440		Data
0	3	3	.214	2	.143	12	.857		Hlth
0	4	4	.174	6	.261	17	.739		Lab
1	15	16	.235	6	.088	62	.912		MedOf
0	12	12	.182	4	.061	62	.939		Nursg
25	1	26	.236	105	.955	5	.045	6	Elecy
39	0	39	.213	169	.923	14	.077	31	Elecn
3	0	3	.375	8	1	0	0	3	Heat
0	4	4	.222	11	.611	7	.389		Desgn
0	0	0	0	5	.357	9	.643		Ilstr
10	0	10	.286	33	.943	2	.057		Draft
5	6	11	.204	26	.481	28	.519		Photo
13	1	14	.184	47	.618	29	.382		Print
5	3	8	.170	36	.766	11	.234	32	TV
52	0	52	.264	196	.995	1	.005	8	Auto
11	1	12	.226	52	.981	1	.019	2	SmEng
293	179	472	.210	1433	.638	814	.362		

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
John F. Coakley, Senior Officer

May 20, 1983
received
3PM

May 20, 1983

MEMORANDUM

To: Charles Glenn
From: John Coakley John Coakley
Subject: Assigned Humphrey Center Enrollments for 1983-84

Please find 4 numbered printouts attached:

1. ORC Exploratory Assignments (Mainstream)
2. ORC Exploratory Assignments (Substantially Separate)
3. ORC Skill-Training Assignments by Home School
4. ORC Skill-Training Assignments by Program

We intend to assign the following numbers of students:

	Black	White	Other	Total
Exploratory	628	177	265	1070
Skill-Training	1385	431	431	2247
TOTAL	2013	608	696	3317
	61%	18%	21%	

Please be advised of the racial/ethnic composition of each of the following sub-sets:

1. Exploratory	Black	White	Other
a) Mainstream	59%	16%	25%
b) Sub. Sep.	54%	24%	22%
c) TOTAL	59%	16%	25%

2. Skill Training (Clusters)	Black	White	Other
a) Commercial Mall	62%	16%	22%
b) Construction	58%	28%	14%
c) Metals	60%	21%	19%
d) Business	59%	19%	22%

	Black	White	Other
e) Health	63%	13%	24%
f) Electricity	58%	19%	23%
g) Graphics	65%	16%	19%
h) Power	52%	22%	26%
i) Medical Office	68%	09%	23%
j) TOTAL	62%	19%	19%

The ORC racial/ethnic percentage goals for 1983-84 are:

	Black	White	Other
High	60%	28%	22%
Ideal	56%	23%	21%
Low	52%	18%	20%

Please also find attached an ORC Application Form which will enable you to "read" the codes on the printouts. Also find attached copies of ORC mainstream Skill-Training preferences.

Lastly, know that printouts #1 to #3 have "dirty data" (e.g., some students with substantially separate designations from 1982-83 who will be mainstreamed in 1983-84). The printouts also contain numbers of other students who were designated substantially separate in 1982-83 and who will continue as such in 1983-84. In some cases, some of the latter students are given ORC designations in keeping with their core evaluations -- despite the grade designations seemingly associated with them.

All students who applied for the Exploratory Program were assigned to it. All substantially separate students referred to us by the Department of Student Support Services received assignments. Some students applied for Skill Programs but did not receive assignments. The latter group fall into three categories:

Category	Number of Applicants
1. Students who expressed general interest but failed to specify any specific interest. (They will be referred to ORC for recruitment.)	207
2. Students who applied for oversubscribed skill programs (first preference)	245
3. Students who applied for undersubscribed skill programs (first preference)	246

Eight programs were fully subscribed and could not accommodate 245 students. Fifteen other programs had insufficient applicants. Twelve programs had available seats and could serve the 246 applicants who expressed first preferences for those programs but who were not assigned for reasons relating to desegregation. However, 168 of those 246 students were interested in four programs: Food Service, Photographic Technology, Banking, Fashion/Interior Design. Therefore, some of those 246 students, although not a large number, could not have been served even if desegregation were not an issue.

It does seem to me that a careful analysis of the applications should cause the school system to target its recruitment on specific programs which are undersubscribed -- for whichever reasons.

While you are reviewing this material, we will be determining AM/PM assignments which are not part of the review process.

JC:ab
Enclosures

xc: Robert Spillane
Henry Dinger
James Caradonio
Franklin Banks

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
John R. Coakley, Senior Officer

ACT

April 5, 1983

MEMORANDUM

To: James Caradonio

From: John Coakley John Coakley

Subject: ORC Capacities for 1983-84

Please provide me with program capacities for ORC for 1983-84. They should include capacities for Substantially Separate Special Needs students as well as for other students.

I suggest that you also give me a second set of figures which we could label "initial assignment goals." Such figures should be in excess of capacities and should be attempts to factor in a "no-show" estimate.

Please give them to me no later than Thursday, April 21st. (If you do not plan to be available during the school vacation week, please provide them to me on Friday, April 15th.) I urge that you consult with Kenneth Caldwell before submitting capacities to me.

For your guidance, I offer the attached picture of 1982-83.

ab
Enclosure

xc: Catherine Ellison
John Canty
Lydia Francis
Patricia M. Blume
Kenneth Caldwell

Note: Please give me separate capacities for "regular" and "substantially separate (mainstream)."

26 COURT STREET, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108 • 726-6200, EXT 5500, 726-6555 EXT 5500 AREA 617

SKILL PROGRAMS
(REG. & SPEC.)

#	Program	Total of Capacities	6/6/82 for 82/83	3/28/83
	Food Service	175	181	119
	Retailing, Marketing and Management	83	86	53
	Cabinetmaking	85	94	70
	Carpentry	90	112	74
	Plumbing	85	92	68
	Building Maintenance and Repair	48	53	40
	Autobody Repair Laboratory	84	100	69
	Machine Laboratory	42	46	24
	Sheet Metal Laboratory	42	53	33
	Welding Laboratory	42	50	34
	Advanced Office and Management	82	79	59
	Legal Office Procedures	42	48	37
	Medical Office Assistant	42	40	32
	Word Processing	42	49	40
	Banking	42	50	34
	Child Care	82	84	63
	Cosmetology	88	92	72
	Fashion/Interior Design	44	52	20
	Hotel Hospitality	44	41	23
	Data Processing	88	98	78
	Health Aide	44	38	22
	Health Laboratory Skills	44	40	18
	Medical Office Assistant - Clinical	44	43	34
	Nursing Assistant	84	87	55
	Electrical Technology	164	166	106
	Electronics Technology	164	173	115
	Heating, Air Conditioning, Refrigeration	2	2	4
	Commercial Design	22	24	18
	Fashion Illustration	22	26	21
	Machine Drafting	22	26	19
	Photographic Technology	66	77	58
	Printing	126	118	94
	Television Production	62	68	46
	Automotive/Truck Repair	170	176	143
	Marine and Small Engine Repair	90	93	40
TOTAL		2498	2657	1865 +16 (?)

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

APR 13 1983

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
John R. Coakley, Senior Officer

April 11, 1983

Mr. Charles Glenn
Mass. Department of Education
1385 Hancock Street
Quincy, MA 02169

Dear Charles,

I am replying to your ORC memorandum of March 24th. I now hope that we will be issuing ORC assignments by May 10th. If we meet our May 1st deadline for issuing K-13 assignments then you should assume that we will be looking for you on or after May 7th to review ORC assignments (with the hope of issuing them by May 10th).

You raised four sets of questions and I am endeavoring to reply to each set.

1. Yes, kindly examine Chart 1 and Chart 2 which portray the initial, Court-approved assignments for 1982-83. Please also note that I have listed Skill Programs by program; we are more concerned about cluster totals and percentages.

   The ORC racial/ethnic percentage goals for 1982-83 have been:

	Black	White	Other
High	60%	31%	19%
Ideal	56%	26%	18%
Low	52%	21%	17%

   We have found that careful adherence to our ORC assignment procedures takes care of desegregation needs at the Center. We also for the first time overassigned to the Skill Programs to compensate for "changes of mind" and poor attendees who were automatically reassigned to the Center. Thus, the combined capacities of the Skill Programs has been 2498; we initially assigned 2657 (2465 Half Day and 192 Week-In students) and we currently serve 1861. Thus, the Skill Program has a utilization ratio of nearly 75%. However, given the attendance rate of high schools generally, we obviously have an underutilization problem of significant proportions. It is our intent to "over-assign" at an even greater rate this year. See my attached April 5th memorandum to James Caradonio.

2. I am asking Mr. Caradonio to document his recruitment efforts, and I will share the report with you. We will not have ORC application tallies before April 25th; our first priority of necessity is the K-12 preparation-work.

3. Please examine Chart 1 (and Chart 3) to determine the enrollment flow to ORC from each high school. In 1980 and 1981 we endeavored to set ORC enrollment limits for each school. However, that practice seems both restrictive and unnecessary. The results in June 1982 did not differ much from previous years when we set limits. (I have printouts for prior years to document this assertion.)

   The answer to your other question in Set Two is to state that it is very difficult to determine the quality of cooperation provided by each sending school. Although the primary motivation for the recent Superintendent's Circular No. 13, Adherence to Federal Court Orders on Desegregation, was not related to ORC matters, both Deputy Peterkin and I saw wisdom in citing ORC policy in the circular.

4. It is my view that ORC's present administration will require more than two years to determine which offerings should be retained, increased or diminished. The writer believes that the Exploratory Program must be re-examined. Although I have no particular competency in matters relating to occupational education, I have observed a steady decline in Exploratory enrollments since 1980. Possibly, the program should be mandated for all students or for those students who major in certain fields at the home schools; possibly the prgram should focus on eighth-graders, rather than ninth-graders. More likely, I should defer to James Caradonio on this topic.

   I would like to think that our "over-assignment" last June was beneficial to Skill Program enrollments and that we will be more aggressive in our "over-assignments" this time around. Interestingly, a comparison of Charts I and III suggests that the yearly "drop-off" in ORC enrollments is not a factor in desegregation.

In 1982 James Caradonio, then newly-appointed as ORC director, wrote a detailed analysis of male-female enrollments (and retention rates) in the ORC programs. His study was too late to be translated into recruitment and enrollment strategies. However, we will "program our computer" to give first priority to new applicants seeking entry into "non-traditional" skill programs.

In summary, relative to the matter of ORC assignments, desegregation of the programs is a comparatively easy task, as is addressing access issues from sending schools. More challenging are the matters of non-attendance or underutilization, waiting lists for Black and Other Minority students which cannot be activated, the disproportion of male and female students in programs, and the direction of the Exploratory Program.

If you think we should meet on this matter I would suggest the week of April 25th unless you are planning to run in the Marathon.

Sincerely,

John Coakley

Senior Officer

JRC:ab
Enclosures

xc: Franklin Banks

Chart 1

Initial ORC Assignments for 1982-83: June 14, 1982

	Half-Day Skill				Exploratory				Total			
	B	W	O	T	B	W	O	T	B	W	O	T
Brighton	69	9	47	125	18	10	13	41	87	19	60	166
Jamaica Plain	91	21	63	175	5	5	15	25	96	26	78	200
West Roxbury	102	32	3	137	22	8	0	30	124	40	3	167
Hyde Park	101	18	4	123	42	3	4	49	143	21	8	172
Burke	92	6	15	113	13	8	4	25	105	14	19	138
Dorchester	182	11	16	209	28	13	10	51	210	24	26	260
South Boston	66	48	37	151	27	18	10	55	93	66	47	206
Charlestown	59	35	34	128	16	6	5	27	75	41	39	155
East Boston	0	42	4	46	0	17	2	19	0	59	6	65
Boston	19	3	3	25	23	2	3	28	42	5	6	53
Technical	13	9	3	25	-	-	-	-	13	9	3	25
Copley	68	19	23	110	26	9	9	44	94	28	32	154
English	220	55	60	335	30	11	8	49	250	66	68	384
Madison	300	191	169	660	74	17	19	110	374	208	188	770
Umana	42	31	9	82	16	4	4	24	58	35	13	106
H. Mann	3	1	1	5	1	0	0	1	4	1	1	6
McKinley	7	5	0	12	-	-	-	-	7	5	0	12
Tileston	4	0	0	4	6	2	0	8	10	2	0	12
TOTAL	1438	536	491	2465	347	133	106	586	1785	669	597	3051
	58%	22%	20%		58%	23%	19%		58%	22%	20%	

Note 1: The Half-Day Skill Program and Exploratory Program included Substantially Separate students.

Note 2: There also were 192 students assigned to the Week-In/Week Out Program (Madison Park High School). The numbers were not included above. The program was disbanded in the summer and the students were offered Half-Day opportunities.

Chart II

Half-Day Programs - Initial Assignments for 1982-83: June 14, 1982

Code	Program	B	W	O	T
A	Food Service	120	18	21	159
B	Retailing, Marketing and Management	49	5	14	68
C	Cabinetmaking	41	24	16	81
D	Carpentry	40	27	10	77
E	Plumbing	40	23	12	75
F	Building Maintenance and Repair	28	6	6	40
G	Autobody Repair Laboratory	27	23	16	66
H	Machine Laboratory	23	5	3	31
I	Sheet Metal Laboratory	22	8	5	35
J	Welding Laboratory	26	13	4	43
K	Advanced Office and Management	54	8	17	79
L	Legal Office Procedures	24	12	12	48
M	Medical Office Assistant	29	5	6	40
N	Word Processing	24	11	14	49
O	Banking	28	10	12	50
P	Child Care	49	23	12	84
Q	Cosmetology	51	21	20	92
R	Fashion/Interior Design	30	8	14	52
S	Hotel Hospitality	30	1	10	41
T	Data Processing	54	27	17	98
U	Health Aide	29	5	4	38
V	Health Laboratory Skills	27	4	9	40
W	Medical Office Assistant - Clinical	27	5	11	43
X	Nursing Assistant	55	11	21	87
Y	Electrical Technology	84	50	32	166
Z	Electronics Technology	104	34	35	173
1	Heating, Air Conditioning, Refrigeration	1	1	0	2
2	Commercial Design	15	7	2	24
3	Fashion Illustration	13	7	6	26
4	Machine Drafting	11	8	7	26
5	Photographic Technology	41	16	20	77
6	Printing	72	26	20	118
7	Television Production	38	8	22	68
8	Automotive/Truck Repair	87	52	37	176
9	Marine and Small Engine Repair	45	24	24	93
TOTAL		1438	536	491	2465
		58%	22%	20%	

Chart III

Current ORC Assignments for 1982-83: April 7, 1983

	Skill Training				Exploratory				Total			
	B	W	O	T	B	W	O	T	B	W	O	T
Brighton	51	4	25	80	25	4	14	43	76	8	39	123
Jamaica Plain	65	12	35	112	9	6	26	41	74	18	61	153
West Roxbury	67	15	3	85	22	6	0	28	89	21	3	113
Hyde Park	68	15	2	85	60	2	4	66	128	17	6	151
Burke	69	6	6	81	29	12	3	44	98	18	9	125
Dorchester	149	7	9	165	26	7	9	42	175	14	18	207
South Boston	51	27	21	99	19	10	6	35	70	37	27	134
Charlestown	39	34	20	93	24	11	8	43	63	45	28	136
East Boston	0	35	3	38	1	31	3	35	1	66	6	73
Boston	19	2	7	28	18	1	4	23	37	3	11	51
Technical	21	13	3	37	-	-	-	-	21	13	3	37
Copley	57	14	11	82	26	9	9	44	83	23	20	126
English	192	45	40	277	41	14	11	66	233	59	51	343
Madison	277	150	89	516	121	44	31	196	398	194	120	712
Umana	49	19	5	73	11	4	1	16	60	23	6	89
J. Mann	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
McKinley	1	3	0	4	0	1	0	1	1	4	0	5
Tileston	3	0	0	3	5	0	0	5	8	0	0	8
TOTAL	1180	402	279	1861	437	162	129	728	1617	564	408	2589
	63%	22%	15%		60%	22%	18%		62%	22%	16%	

Note 1: The above figures were extracted from a Race-by-Grade printout and includes both FIRST SEMESTER and SECOND SEMESTER enrollments in the Exploratory Program. The approximate breakdown by semester is:

	Black	White	Other	Total
First Semester	268	89	79	436
Second Semester	169	73	50	292

Note 2: The chart which follows was based on data as of March 29, 1981. The data in the two charts differ slightly.

Chart IV

Current ORC Assignments for 1982-83: March 29, 1983

Code	Program	B	W	O	T	M	F	T
A	Food Service	90	15	14	119	79	49	119
B	Retailing, Marketing and Management	39	7	7	53	24	29	53
C	Cabinetmaking	40	22	8	70	66	4	70
D	Carpentry	38	29	7	74	71	3	74
E	Plumbing	36	24	8	68	67	1	68
F	Building Maintenance and Repair	26	8	6	40	39	1	40
G	Autobody Repair Laboratory	36	16	17	69	67	2	69
H	Machine Laboratory	17	4	3	24	18	6	24
I	Sheet Metal Laboratory	20	9	4	33	27	6	33
J	Welding Laboratory	20	9	5	34	34	0	34
K	Advanced Office and Management	39	10	10	59	18	41	59
L	Legal Office Procedures	22	6	9	37	5	32	37
M	Medical Office Assistant	26	2	4	32	4	28	32
N	Word Processing	22	10	8	40	12	28	40
O	Banking	24	5	5	34	14	20	34
P	Child Care	46	7	10	63	9	54	63
Q	Cosmetology	41	13	18	72	2	70	72
R	Fashion/Interior Design	13	4	3	20	3	17	20
S	Hotel Hospitality	18	2	3	23	14	9	23
T	Data Processing	46	19	13	78	40	38	78
U	Health Aide	19	1	2	22	4	18	22
V	Health Laboratory Skills	12	2	4	18	5	13	18
W	Medical Office Assistant - Clinical	25	2	7	34	4	30	34
X	Nursing Assistant	37	6	12	55	4	51	55
Y	Electrical Technology	57	33	16	106	103	3	106
Z	Electronics Technology	64	26	25	115	107	8	115
1	Heating, Air Conditioning, Refrigeration	2	1	1	4	3	1	4
2	Commercial Design	14	2	2	18	12	6	18
3	Fashion Illustration	16	4	1	21	8	13	21
4	Machine Drafting	7	5	7	19	19	0	19
5	Photographic Technology	38	8	12	58	27	31	58
6	Printing	54	29	11	94	70	24	94
7	Television Production	34	4	8	46	34	12	46
8	Automotive/Truck Repair	77	36	30	143	141	2	143
9	Marine and Small Engine Repair	33	21	16	70	70	0	70
Other ?		8	3	5	16	4	12	16
TOTAL		1156	404	321	1881	1219	662	1881
		61%	22%	17%		65%	35%	

Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

March 24th 1983

TO: John Coakley

FROM: Charles Glenn CG.

RE: HHH Occupational Resource Center

As I understand your schedule, I should expect to review proposed assignments to the ORC around May 15th. This review is distinct from - though inevitably related to - the monitoring of programs in the ORC by the Division of Occupational Education.

My concern will be with the projected enrollment of programs by race (and sex) as required by the Unified Plan; staff of the Division will be concerned with full implementation of programs and other considerations outlined in the Orders and in our procedural manual. We will of course be in close communication.

Since I know that time will be of the essence in this review of proposed assignments, I am writing to seek to anticipate the questions which I will be asking.

(1) Will the enrollment of each program be racially desegregated? Are there special considerations which you employ in making the assignments to assess desegregation impact?

(2) What recruitment efforts will have been made to correct any disproportionate enrollments (by race or sex) in 1982-83? How effective have these efforts been, as measured by applications?

(3) From which schools are students drawn to attend the ORC? Has full cooperation been provided by the sending schools?

(4) Will the ORC be at operational capacity in 1983-84? Was the retention rate satisfactory in 1982-83, and, if not, did this have a negative effect upon desegregation?

The first two questions seem to me essential to the "review and approval" process for 1983-84 assignments. The other two bear more upon our desegregation monitoring responsibilities.

I would appreciate your seeking to anticipate other questions which might arise when I receive the proposed assignments, as you did so notably with respect to the exam schools.

cc. David Cronin, Franklin Banks

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
John B. Coakley, Senior Officer

May 24, 1983

MEMORANDUM

To: Charles Glenn

From: John Coakley John Coakley

Subject: Further ORC Data

As requested, please find capacity information for skill programs at ORC. Also find a history of 1982-83 enrollments viz-a-viz capacities.

1983-84 CAPACITIES

	MAINSTREAM	SUB. SEP.	TOTAL
A	120	12	132
B	80	3	83
C	80	5	85
D	80	10	90
E	80	5	85
F	40	8	48
G	60	3	63
H	80	2	82
I	40	4	44
J	80	5	85
K	80	3	83
L	40	2	42
M	40	2	42
N	40	2	42
O	40	2	42
P	40	2	42
Q	80	8	88
R	40	4	44
S	40	6	46
T	120	6	126
U	40	4	44
V	40	2	42
W	80	4	84
X	40	4	44
Y	120	4	124
Z	160	8	168

352

26 COURT STREET, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 021 • 726-6200, EXT 5500, 726-6555, EXT 5500 AREA 617

	MAINSTREAM	SUB. SEP.	TOTAL
1	40	2	42
2	40	4	44
3	40	4	44
4	40	2	42
5	40	3	43
6	120	6	126
7	80	4	84
8	200	10	210
9	40	4	44

BY CLUSTER

	82-83 CAP	82-83 INIT. ASSIGN.	82-83 4/10/83	83-84 CAP	83-84 INIT. ASSIGN.
COMM.MALL	448	546	377	477	439
CONSTRUCTION	348	273	246	308	305
METALS	110	175	156	274	198
BUSINESS	254	274	213	293	321
HEALTH	254	205	126	172	121
ELECTRICITY	290	341	223	334	301
GRAPHICS	330	339	257	383	244
POWER	220	269	210	254	250
MED. OFFICE	44	43	33	84	68
TOTAL	2398	2465	1841	2579	2247

Cluster	Program Codes
Commercial Mall	A - B - O - P - Q - R - S
Construction	C - D - E - F
Metals	G - H - I - J
Business	K - L - N - T
Health	U - V - M - X
Electricity	Y - Z - 1
Graphics	2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7
Power	8 - 9
Medical Office	W

	82-83 CAP	82-83 INIT. ASSIGN.	82-83 4/10/83	83-84 CAP	83-84 INIT. ASSIGN.
A	175	159	117	132	126
B	43	68	52	83	43
C	85	81	70	85	86
D	90	77	71	90	106
E	85	75	66	85	70
F	88	40	39	48	43
G	84	66	68	63	91
H	42	31	23	82	22

	82-83 CAP	82-83 INIT. ASSIGN.	82-83 4/10/83	83-84 CAP	83-84 INIT. ASSIGN.
I	42	35	32	44	37
J	42	43	33	85	48
K	62	79	59	83	54
L	42	48	37	42	46
M	42	40	32	42	18
N	62	49	40	42	62
O	22	50	34	42	29
P	42	84	61	42	67
Q	88	92	71	88	118
R	44	52	20	44	35
S	34	41	22	46	21
T	88	98	77	126	159
U	44	33	22	44	14
V	84	40	18	42	23
W	44	43	33	84	68
X	84	87	54	44	66
Y	84	166	106	124	110
Z	164	173	113	168	183
1	42	2	4	42	8
2	32	24	18	44	18
3	32	26	21	44	14
4	32	26	20	42	35
5	66	77	58	43	54
6	126	118	94	126	76
7	42	68	46	84	47
8	130	176	141	210	197
9	90	93	69	44	53
TOTAL	2398	2465	1841	2579	2247

JC:ab

xc: Robert Spillane
Henry Dinger
James Caradonio
Franklin Banks

Addendum

Analysis of Skill Programs

New to ORC	= 902
From Exploratory	= 312
From Skill, new choice	= 120
From Skill/no choice	= 913
	2247

4. Special Education

Division of Special Education

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

May 27, 1983

MEMORANDUM

TO: John H. Lawson

FROM: Roger W. Brown

RE: Boston Monitoring for Desegregation Order

The Division of Special Education had two specific objectives to address as part of the Desegregation Order.

(1) To ensure at least one resource room in each school and at least three special schools in each district.

(2) Each school shall have special educators and materials.

A team of five staff from the Greater Boston Regional Center conducted desegregation monitoring as part of a regularly scheduled District V special education monitoring. Thirty percent of other Boston Public programs were also monitored and the desegregation objectives were addressed.

In addition, the Department of Student Support Services submitted written information indicating resource rooms, substantially separate classrooms, teacher and aide positions. Site visits were made to verify the information.

Other information submitted for review included memoranda on the process for assigning special needs students to placements outside of their geocoded district, the Policy and Procedural Manual, Department of Student Support Services and the Procedural Manual of the Student Services Unit, Department of Implementation.

BOSTON

SPECIAL EDUCATION/DESEGREGATION MONITORING

SUMMARY REPORT

Greater Boston Regional Education Center

Team Members: Pamela Kaufmann, Special Education Team Leader
Mary Beth Scalice, Special Education
John Abramson, Special Education
Marie Lindahl, Special Education
David Keeler, School Management

May 19, 1983

BOSTON

SPECIAL EDUCATION/DESEGREGATION MONITORING

SUMMARY REPORT

Introduction

Monitoring Objectives (1) and (3) have been met. The validation process utilized included the review of Boston Public Schools submitted paper documentation, as well as, on-site visitations conducted by regional office staff.

- Monitoring Objectives:

  Objective #1

  To ensure at least one resource room in each school, and at least three special schools in each district.

  Objective #2

  Each school shall have special educators and materials.

  Objective #3

  Determination of out-of-geocode district placements.

- Process/Supportive Documentation

  See Special Education Desegregation Data Analysis Report

- Team Members: Pamela Kaufmann - Special Education Team Leader
  Mary Beth Scalice - Special Education
  John Abramson - " "
  Marie Lindahl - " "
  David Keeler - School Management

- Supportive Documentation:

  Desegregation monitoring conducted on-site as part of scheduled District V monitoring, transportation monitoring as well as 30% of other district Boston Public Schools programs prior to June 1, 1983.

  Department of Student Support Service's position control forms submitted February 22, 1983, for every school, indicating resource rooms, substantially separate classrooms, teacher and aide positions. Site visits indicate that some new programs have been added which are not listed on these forms.

  Boston Public Schools Department of Student Support Services' LEA Annual Program Plan for Special Education, which includes personnel roster of special education staff by school, submitted January, 1983.

Memo of March 14, 1983, from Kenneth Caldwell to Pamela Kaufmann which explains the process whereby special needs students are assigned to placements out of their geocoded district. Attached to this memo is the Policy and Procedural Manual, Department of Student Support Services, pp. 75-79; Procedural Manual of the Student Services Unit, Department of Implementation, pp. 18-31.

Memo of April 6, 1983 from John Coakley to Pamela Kaufmann and Mary Beth Scalice which further explains this process, and the role of the Department of Implementation in assigning special needs students out of their geocoded district.

Findings/Conclusions/Recommendations:

- Supplies: Although several schools have been cited for inadequate materials, there are individual instances within schools of excellent maintenance of materials primarily related to length of tenure of an individual teacher. A clearly emerging concern is that of supplies and materials for recently employed, transferred teachers and bilingual classes. Twenty out of thirty-four schools visited (at the time of this writing) found one or more teachers who felt they did not have adequate educational (i.e. books) teaching materials. Many mentioned the lack of basic supplies (i.e. toilet paper) and manipulatives. Teachers received materials from a variety of sources: building principals, Court Street supervisors, ETL's, other teachers, other schools, district office... Many had purchased their own. Some teachers stated they did not wish their supervisors to know that they felt materials were inadequate or outdated, as they felt this would lead to repercussions. We could not determine any organized system of authority for ordering, distributing or keeping track of materials.

  Develop a system for ordering, distribution, inventory control and budget maintenance for educational supplies and materials, and insure equalization of material distribution.

- Educators: The following represent issues related to educators in the special classes visited. These issues may extend beyond the specifications and objectives for monitoring the court-order, but we feel our report would be incomplete if they were not cited.
  (1) Long-term teacher absenteeism results in substitute replacements who are non-certified in special education.
  (2) Bilingual substitutes seem to be harder to find, and our visits found either no substitutes when these special educators were absent, or monolingual substitutes. - In addition, bilingual special educators were found servicing both monolingual and bilingual students during the same periods.

(3) Although resource rooms and substantially separate classrooms have been identified with certified special educators, our first phase of monitoring revealed that seven out of twelve schools had from one to seven classes that either exceeded the number of students mandated by the laws of Chapter 766, or had students enrolled which exceeded the age span requirements.

These findings warrant a review of caseloads in non-compliant schools to determine if the numbers of educators are appropriate.

Efforts shall be made to document and ensure that long-term substitutes are appropriately qualified.

(*During our 1st (April) phase of site visits, Boston Public Schools issued lay-off notices to ____ teachers, both regular and special, due to anticipated cuts in budgets, enrollments, and other reasons. According to teacher and ETL interviews, more absenteeism is a critical effect of these notices, as laid off teachers may attempt to use accumulated sick time.)

Other Issues:

(1) The formal C.766 District V and Transportation Reports will be available by June 9, 1983. Where there exists class sizes that exceed the limits mandated by Chapter 766, we may wish to further discuss this issue in the light of any potential relationship to student assignments.

(2) When the Division of Special Education makes an LEA assignment of a student to Boston and the student lives in a foster home not necessarily in Boston, there sometimes is a dispute from the Department of Implementation relative to accepting responsibility to arrange for transportation services to a special education program.

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
VISITED TO VERIFY RESOURCE ROOMS AND SPECIAL CLASSES

SCHOOL	SPECIAL EDUCATION CLASSES
Brighton High School	5 Resource Rooms (1 bilingual Spanish, 1 - 1/2 day Resource Room) 2 Supportive Academic Remediation 2 Learning Adaptive Behavior 1 Learning Disabled
Edison Middle School	3 Resource Rooms (1 bilingual Spanish) 1 Learning Adaptive Behavior 1 Supportive Academic Remediation 2 Hearing Impaired
Hamilton Elementary School	1 Resource Room (1/2 day) 2 Learning Adaptive Behavior 1 Primary Transition
Winship Elementary	2 Resource Rooms (1 bilingual Spanish, 1 - 1/2 day Resource Room) 4 Early Childhood (1 bilingual Spanish, 1 - 1/2 day Early Childhood)
Gardner Elementary School	2 Resource Rooms (1 bilingual Spanish) 1 Supportive Academic Remediation
M. E. Curley Middle School	4 Resource Rooms (1 bilingual Spanish) 2 Learning Adaptive Behavior (1 bilingual Spanish) 2 Learning Disabled (1 bilingual Spanish) 1 Supportive Academic Remediation
Agassiz Elementary School	3 Resource Rooms (1 bilingual Spanish) 1 Developmental Day Care 1 Physically Handicapped 1 Vision (pre-school) 2 Supportive Academic Remediation (1 bilingual Spanish) 2 Learning Adaptive Behavior 2 Early Childhood
Parkman Elementary School	1 Resource Room 1 Learning Disabled 1 Learning Adaptive Behavior
Washington Irving Middle School	4 Resource Rooms 3 Learning Disabled 1 Learning Academic Remediation 1 Vision Resources

Continued - Page 2

West Roxbury High School	5 Resource Rooms (1 bilingual Greek) 1 Learning Adaptive Behavior 2 Supportive Academic Remediation 1 Learning Disabled 1 Physically Handicapped 1 Hearing Impaired
R. G. Shaw Middle School	2 Resource Rooms 1 Learning Disabled 1 Learning Adaptive Behavior 4 Multiple Handicapped (1 Home Ec) 1 Education and Social Development
Mozart Elementary School	1 Resource Room (1/2 day)
Beethoven Elementary School	1 Resource Room 1 Vision Resources 3 Learning Adaptive Behavior
Hyde Park High School	4 Resource Rooms (2-2 periods per day) 1/2 Learning Adaptive Behavior 2 Supportive Academic Remediation 1 Learning Disabled 2 Multiple Handicapped Occupational Skills Development Vocational Program: Blue Star Restaurant Copy Center Sheltered Workshop Business and Consumer Exploratory Home Economics Vocational Academics Building Maintenance (Chap. 74 Machine Shop Magnet Program)
W. B. Rogers Middle School	4 Resource Rooms 2 Learning Disabled 1 Learning Adaptive Behavior
Channing Elementary	1 Resource Room 1 Learning Adaptive Behavior
Grew Elementary	1 Resource Room 1 Learning Adaptive Behavior
J. Burke High School	4 Resource Rooms 2 Learning Disabled 3 Supportive Academic Remediation 1 Learning Adaptive Behavior

Continued - Page 3

Dorchester High School	2 Resource Rooms 1 Learning Adaptive Behavior 1 Supportive Academic Remediation 1 Occupational Skills Development Center, vocational academics
Cleveland Middle School	5 Resource Rooms 2 Learning Disabled 1 Physically Handicapped 1 Learning Adaptive Behavior
S. Greenwood Elementary School	3 Learning Disabled 3 Resource Rooms (1 bilingual Spanish)
Wilson Middle School	6 Resource Rooms 1 Learning Adaptive Behavior 1 Supportive Academic Remediation Education and Social Development
Holland Elementary School	4 Resource Rooms (Substantially separate programs are listed in documentation, although monitoring team did not have time to visit these classrooms.)
Kenney Elementary School	1 Resource Room 1 Learning Disabled
Marshall Elementary School	4 Resource Rooms 1 Learning Adaptive Behavior 4 Early Childhood 1 Student Academic Remediation
Murphy Elementary	2 Physically Handicapped 1 Learning Adaptive Behavior 1 Education and Social Development 3 Student Academic Remediation 1 Vision Impaired 1 Multiply Handicapped 1 Resource Room
South Boston High School	3 Resource Rooms 1 Education and Social Development 1 Learning Disabled 1 Supportive Academic Remediation 1 Learning Adaptive Behavior
M. J. Perkins	1 Resource Room 1 Supportive Academic Remediation

McCormack Middle School	4 Resource Rooms (1 Bilingual) 1 Supportive Academic Remediation 1 Learning Disabled 1 Physically Handicapped
Condon Elementary	2 Resource Rooms (1 Spanish and Cape Verdean) 3 Early Childhood 2 Developmental Day Care 3 Learning Disabled 1 Learning Adaptive Behavior
Charlestown High School	1 Learning Adaptive Behavior 1 Learning Disabled 5 Resource Rooms (1 is mixed Chinese and English, 1 is mixed Spanish and English) Occupational Skills Develpment Center Program: 2 Multiple Handicapped 1 Culinary Arts 1 Business 1 Building and Grounds 1 Sheltered Workshop 1 Supportive Academic Remediation 1 Activities Daily Living
Edwards Middle School	3 Resource Rooms 2 Supportive Academic Remediation
Elliot Elementary School	1 Learning Adaptive Behavior 1 Supportive Academic Remediation 1 Resource Room
W. Harvard - Kent School	3 Learning Adaptive Behavior 1 Developmental Day Care 1 Resource Room 2 Learning Disabled
East Boston High School	5 Resource Rooms (1-1/2 day) 1 Supportive Academic Remediation 1 Learning Adaptive Behavior
Barnes Elementary School	1 Supportive Academic Remediation 5 Resource Rooms (1 bilingual)
Adams Elementary School	2 Learning Disabled 1 Primary Transition Class 1 Resource Room
Hugh O'Donnell Elementary	1 Resource Room

Continued - Page 5

Boston High School	5 Resource Rooms 1 Supportive Academic Remediation
Boston Latin Academy	1 Resource Room
C. Mackey Middle School	5 Resource Rooms (1 bilingual) 1 Learning Adaptive Behavior
Tileston Alternative (502.4i) Education Center	3 High School Classes 4 Middle School Classes 1 Elementary Interim 1 Middle School Interim
McKinley Middle School (502.4i)	11 Substantially Separate
McKinley High School	11 Substantially Separate
Mario Umana High School	5 Resource Rooms 1 Learning Disabled 1 Learning Adaptive Behavior
Carter Elementary (502.4i)	6 Multiple Handicapped Classes
Haley Elementary School	1 Resource Room
J. Hennigan Elementary School	3 Resource Rooms 1 Education and Social Development 1 Learning Adaptive Behavior 2 Supportive Academic Remediation (bilingua 1 Supportive Academic Remediation (English) 1 Learning Disabled
Guild Elementary School	1 Resource Room
Jamaica Plains High School	1 Learning Disabled 1 Supportive Academic Remediation 5 Resource Rooms (1 bilingual)

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

ECEIV
MAY 16 1983
STON REGIONAL
ION OF SPECIAL ED

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL AND LABOR RELATIONS
MANAGER
IDA WHITE

May 10, 1983

Pamela Kaufman
Greater Boston Regional Education Center
27 Cedar Street
Wellesley, MA 02181

Dear Ms. Kaufman:

Thank you for your letter dated April 4, 1983 in which the Special Education waivers for 1982-1983 were addressed. In response to your inquiry the following information is included for your review:

First Year Requests Approved

Approved for 006. A first year provisional hired on 9-01-82 as Teacher of the Deaf of the Mann Unit. First time employment with the Boston Public Schools.

Approved for 006. A first year provisional hired on 10-26-82 as Teacher of the Deaf at the Mann Unit. First time employment with the Boston Public Schools.

Approved for 003. This office requested a first year waiver, however according to your records approvable as second year. We are in agreement.

Court Ordered Requests - First Year

is an academic teacher in the Alternative Education Program. In the Fall of 1983 Thomas Hehir, Senior Level Advisor for High School Special Education Programs, requested from your office some clarification regarding certification for academic teachers in Alternative Programs. Presently, is teaching academic subjects to regular and special needs students in a mainstream capacity.

Court Ordered Requests - First Year (continued)

Notified on April 15, 1983 that first year waiver request was not approved. Requested that appropriate school administrator's signature be obtained immediately.

Notified on April 15, 1983 that waiver request was denied. According to your records not waiverable, therefore informed to present certificate immediately. Moderate Approval presented to this office on May 5, 1983. A copy is attached here for your records.

Notified on April 15, 1983 that first year waiver request was not approved. Informed that evidence of course enrollment and regular education certificate be presented immediately.

Notified on April 15, 1983 that first year waiver request was not approved. Informed that evidence of course enrollment and regular education certificate be presented immediately.

Notified on April 15, 1983 that first year waiver request was not approved. Requested that appropriate school administrators signature be obtained immediately.

Notified on April 15, 1983 that first year waiver request was not approved. Specifically, referred to Lewis & Clark credentials. Is currently in the process of reviewing credentials with State Department Educational Specialist to determine next step.

- Notified on April 15, 1983 that waiver request was approved as third year waiver. Informed that approval must be presented by June 30, 1983 prior to commencing fourth year in order to be hired under contract.

Program and job descriptions were forwarded to Mary Miklos in the Certification Office on April 19, 1983 on the following individuals:

- Notified on May 6, 1983 that first year waiver request was not approved, because files indicated that application was not on file. Informed on May 6, 1983 that application for certificate Teacher of Young Special Needs be made immediately.

Notified on April 15, 1983 that first year waiver request was not approved. Informed that evidence of program enrollment and regular education certificate be presented immediately. Bilingual Elementary and Elementary certificate presented on December 16, 1982. It is included here for your records.

Court Ordered Requests (continued)

- Notified on April 15, 1983 that first year waiver request was not approved. Informed to present evidence of program enrollment and regular education certificate immediately. These are included here for your review.

- submitted a letter of resignation on December 1, 1982 after the waiver requests were processed. At the time of his resignation, both myself and the Personnel Analyst for Bilingual Programs met with to discuss his reasons for resigning. At this time a decision was made to transfer him into the Bilingual Program due to the needs of that department. Therefore, he is no longer employed as a Special Educator.

- Notified on April 15, 1983 that first year waiver request was not approved. Also, requested a meeting to discuss certification situation. Conversations with Mary Miklos, in Certification Department, indicate that student teaching is necessary for receipt of certification. Currently, in process of obtaining a student teaching situation.

- Notified on April 15, 1983 that first year waiver request was not approved. Informed to present evidence of program enrollment and regular education certificate. Met to discuss particular situation. In the process of obtaining letter from the University of Puerto Rico in regards to the accreditation visit of NCATE for the program from which she graduated with a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Elementary Education - Special Education. Also, scheduled to take Bilingual Proficiency examination this summer.

Second Year Request Approved

- Waiver request should be for 004 not 003. Please correct.

Court Ordered Requests - Second Year

- Notified on April 15, 1983 that waiver request was not approved as second year, but instead as third year request. Informed that evidence of program enrollment was needed. Presented evidence on May 4, 1983. A copy of letter included here for your review. Also, informed that certificate must be presented by June 30, 1983 in order to be hired under contract.

- An error was made in submitting waiver request for the school year 1981 -1982. An amendment was made to the School Committee minutes to read second year waiver instead of third year waiver when error was detected in June of 1982. A copy of amendment is attached. In addition, request for this year was, again, erroneously prepared to read second year waiver. It should be third year waiver. Requesting that it be approved as a third year waiver for 1982-1983.

- Notified on April 15, 1983 that waiver request was not approved. Informed to present evidence of program enrollment immediately. On May 3, 1983 submitted evidence stating that currently enrolled in Ph. D. Special Education program leading to State certification/approval. A copy is attached for your review.

Court Ordered Requests - Second Year (continued)

- Notified on April 15, 1983 that second year waiver request was not approved. Informed that evidence of program enrollment must be presented. Also, suggested that approval as an Instructor of Vocational Special Needs may be appropriate and not a Moderate approval. Presented a provisional approval as Instructor of Vocational Special Needs pending completion of fifteen (15) credits. This is submitted here for your records. However, it is not clear whether there is a need to continue processing waiver requests for those individuals seeking approvals as Instructors of Vocational Special Needs. In addition, it has been a concern of this department as to whether provisionally approved Instructors of Vocational Special Needs are to be treated as equals with permanently approved Instructors of Vocational Special Needs. In other words, is this department to consider provisionally approved individuals for positions as one considers permanently approved individuals? Please advise. It is imperative that this issue be addressed now in order to prepare ourselves for the following school year, since we are in the process of making some staffing decisions.

- Notified on April 15, 1983 that second year waiver request was not approved. Informed that evidence of program enrollment must be presented. Also, suggested that approval as an Instructor of Vocational Special Needs may be appropriate and not Moderate approval. Submitted evidence of program enrollment on April 25, 1983. This is presented for your review. In addition, per a telephone conversation with Mr. Curran in the Division of Occupational Education, I was informed that would not be eligible for approval as an Instructor of Vocational Special Needs due to the fact that he currently does not hold an occupational approval. Industrial Arts certificate does not qualify. Therefore, please advise as to how this department should proceed in advising

Court Ordered Requests - Third Year

Notified on April 15, 1983 that third year waiver request was not approved, informed that evidence of program enrollment was necessary and that evidence of certification/approval must be presented by June 30, 1983 in order to be hired under contract. Informed this department, per telephone conversation, that courses will be completed by June 1983 and will forward all credentials to this office and certification bureau.

- Notified on April 15, 1983 that third year waiver request was not approved. Informed that evidence of program enrollment and regular education certificate were necessary. Also, evidence of certification/approval must be presented by June 30, 1983. Attached is a copy of Mr. Williams regular education certification.

- Notified on April 15, 1983 that third year waiver was not approved due to lack of evidence of regular education certificate. Elementary certificate is attached here for your records.

Court Ordered Requests - Third Year (continued)

- Notified on April 15, 1983 that third year waiver was not approved. Informed that evidence of program enrollment be presented immediately.

· Presented Moderate approval on April 21, 1983. Copy is enclosed.

- Notified on April 15, 1983 that third year waiver was not approved. Informed that appropriate college administrator's signature was needed.

- Notified on April 15, 1983 that waiver request was not approved. Presented a letter from the University stating that requirements for Moderate Special Needs will be completed by June 30, 1983.

It became evident in reviewing the response from your office that a number of concerns surfaced. For example, this office is now instituting a new procedure for requiring information necessary for filing waivers. Individuals requiring a waiver in Special Education will be asked to present the original copy of their regular education certification, a statement on official letterhead from the University stating that they are enrolled in a program leading to state certification, official transcripts of all courses taken up to date, a copy of application submitted to the Bureau of Teacher Certification, and Forms A and B with the appropriate signature. This will now be a required prerequiste prior to being hired under contract. However, for those individuals whose educational studies took place outside of the state it may be problematic acquiring some of this documentation. In addition, some of the teachers in the past have submitted all their credentials to the Certification Department and a time lapse has occurred whereby some action has not been taken. It is not clear at this point as to which direction we should be focusing our efforts with respect to this matter.

In addition, for those individuals who were notified that their waiver requests were not approved and have not yet responded, we will continue to monitor their progress. However, in the event, that we may need to request waivers in the coming school year we will consider them as having used one of the three (3) waivers allowed.

Thank you for your professional consideration regarding this matter. Awaiting an early reply.

Sincerely,

Ida White, Manager
Personnel/Labor Relations

Mirna Vega

Mirna Vega
Analyst/Special Education

cc: Kenneth C. Caldwell

Enclosures

IW/mlh

Greater Boston Regional Education Center
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

27 Cedar Street, Wellesley, Massachusetts 02181 431-7825

April 4, 1983

Ida White
Manager
Personnel and Labor Relations
Boston Public Schools
26 Court Street
Boston, MA 02108

Dear Ms. White:

The following persons have been recommended for approval of their application for waiver of teacher certification:

1st Year Requests Approved

- 004
- 004 (She requested 003, but 004 is appropriate.)
· 003
- 004
· 003
- 006 (Please provide us with role and location as she is not listed on the personnel roster.)
· 006 (Please provide us with role and location as she is not listed on the personnel roster.)
- Requested 1st yr. waiver - according to our records, approvable as 2nd yr. 003

Court Ordered Requests - 1st Year

We have reviewed these applications in light of the three year time line for obtaining certification, and our records of previous requests. We are providing this information to assist you in monitoring the progress of the certification process.

In both court-ordered and non-court ordered cases, we remind you that third year waivered personnel shall be appropriately certified at the beginning of their fourth year in order to continue their teaching of special education students. In those instances where discrepancies exist and where we have suggested a candidate is unwaiverable, we would expect a response from your office providing the needed information, or plan of action, regarding uncertified personnel.

According to our records applied for a firts year waiver in 1980-81 school year. This would constitute the third year of waiver eligibility, however, there is no evidence of progress leading to certification over the three year period.

Request for 1st year 004 lacking appropriate school administrator's signature.

- 1st year 003
    - According to our records, she requested a second year waiver in the 1980-81 school year. This would constitute her fourth year waiver request. As such, she is not waiverable.
- 1st year request for 003, no evidence of regular certification or program enrollment.
    - no evidence of regular certification; pending evidence of program completion at Providence College.
- lacking appropriate signature of school administrator.
    - in February, 1982, the office of certification informed her that she required an approved program in special education; Lewis and Clark credentials are not sufficient for 006. There is no evidence of attempts to enroll in an appropriate program.
- According to our records, she applied for waiver in 1980-81 school year This would constitute her 3rd year.

The following requests were forwarded for review to Dennis DiCarlo in the Certification Office, located in Quincy:

057
057
- 02
· 057
- 057
057
· 057

The following 1st year requests require additional information and/or are not approvable as submitted:

- no evidence of regular certification or program enrollments.
- no certification enclosed; 003 waiver request is lacking evidence of program enrollment.

- no evidence of regular certification.

-application unsigned by superintendent. According to our records, she was notified in May 1981, that student teaching is necessary for receipt of certification. No evidence of program enrollment submitted.

- no evidence of certification or program enrollment.

2nd Year Request Approved

- 003
- 003
003
- 003
- 003

Court Ordered Requests, 2nd Year

- 003

- applied for 1st court ordered waiver in 1980-81. This would constitute her third year request. There is no evidence of program enrollment or progress toward certification. Bilingual teachers are eligible for a fourth year waiver by approval of the Board of Education. As submitted, unwaiverable.

- 003

- Last year she applied for 3rd year waiver. Unwaiverable for 4th year.

The following 2nd year requests require additional information and/or are not approvable as submitted:

- 003 waiver request lacking evidence of program enrollment.

- appears A27 waiver may be appropriate. 003 waiver request lacking appropriate signature of program administrator.

- appears A27 waiver may be appropriate. 003 waiver request lacking evidence of enrollment in program.

3rd Year Requests Approved

- 003

Court Ordered Requests 3rd Year

- 003
- 003

003 - lacking appropriate program administrator's signature.

- 003 - lacking regular certification and evidence of program enrollment.

003 - lacking regular certification.

- 003 - no evidence of program enrollment.

003

- requested 002 this year; last year requested 003. Pending receipt of 003 from Office of Certification.
- 003
- 003 - inappropriate administrator's signature.
- 003 (last year applied for 057)
- 003

003

Thank you for your time and patience through this trying process. We look forward to meeting with you.

Pamela Kaufmann
Pamela Kaufmann
Regional Director of Special Education

Mary Beth Scalice
Mary Beth Scalice
Boston Liaison

cc: Myrna Vega
Dennis DiCarlo
John Abramson

PK/MBS:vac

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS WHERE NON CERTIFIED SUBSTITUTES WERE REPLACING REGULAR TEACHERS OR NO SUBSTITUTES WERE AVAILABLE

SCHOOL	CLASS	FINDING
Mario Umana High School	Resource Room	long-term substitute replaced by per diem substitute on day of site visit
Mackey Middle School	Learning Adaptive Behavior	long-term substitute
Jamaica Plain High School	Supportive Academic Remediation	long-term substitute
Barnes Elementary	Resource Room	no substitute on day of site visit
Adams Elementary	Learning Disabled	short-term substitute
Elliot Elementary	Learning Adaptive Behavior	long-term substitute
	Resource Room	third long-term substitute this year, previous two were not certified
Charlestown High School	Bilingual Resource Room	monolingual substitute day of site visit, Chinese aide hired two days prior to visit
	Occupational Skills Development Center Culinary Arts	sign on door said "closed" teacher unavailable, unable to determine where students were
Edwards Middle School	Supportive Academic Remediation	long-term substitute
	Resource Room	long-term substitute
Agazziz Elementary School	Bilingual Student Academic Remediation	no substitute day of site visit
	Supportive Academic Remediation	long-term substitute
Hyde Park High School	Resource Room	one long-term substitute
	Resource Room	one long-term substitute
W. B. Rogers Middle	Learning Adaptive Behavior	long-term substitute

SCHOOL	CLASS	FINDING
J. Burke High School	Resource Room	short-term substitute
	Resource Room	no substitute available day of site visit
	Learning Adaptive Behavior	short-term substitute
Cleveland Middle School	Bilingual Resource Room	no substitute available day of site visit
Marshall Elementary	Resource Room	long-term substitute
South Boston High School	Learning Disabled	long-term substitute
Condon Elementary School	Bilingual Resource Room	no substitute available day of site visit
East Boston High School	Resource Room	short-term substitute

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
WHERE SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS WERE REPORTED LACKING
THROUGH TEACHER INTERVIEWS

Mario Umana High School

Mackey Middle School

Jamaica Plain High School

Boston High School

Barnes Elementary School

Charlestown High School

Edwards Middle School

Brighton High School

Edison Middle School

Hamilton Elementary School

Winship Elementary School

M. E. Curley Middle School

West Roxbury High School

Washington Irving Middle School

R. G. Shaw Middle School

Beethoven Elementary School

Hyde Park High School

W. B. Rogers Middle School

Channing Elementary School

J. Burke High School

Dorchester High School

Wilson Middle School

Holland Elementary School

Condon Elementary School

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

September 14, 1982

MEMORANDUM

TO: Evaluation TEAM Leaders

FROM: Over/Under Representation Project

RE: PFD Representation for newly placed 502.3 Minority Students

The Boston Public Schools have been cited for four years for the disproportionate placement of minorities in the 502.3 prototype. As a result of this continued disproportion, all black and Hispanic students in the 502.3 prototype were reviewed in the school year (81-82) with appropriate minority representation at their 766 review. This year (82-83) you will need to review all newly placed 502.3 minority students.

Before reviewing the newly placed 502.3 minority students a PFD team must be identified. Included in this team is the ETL, a minority representative, resource room teacher, and regular education teacher. The PFD team must insure that the 502.3 minority students reviewed have met all PFD requirements (see attached form).

If PFD requirements have not been met, indicate on the form which ones are missing, and reschedule within two months a review that complies with all PFD requirements.

If all PFD requirements have been satisified, indicate it in the appropriate space and proceed with the regularly scheduled review with the appropriate minority representation.

In addition, this is to inform you that the first PFD onsite visit will begin in October.

If there are any questions, or for further clarification please contact Idola Williams or Ronda Goodale at 726-6200, extension 5955. Thank you for your continued professional cooperation.

26 COURT STREET • BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108 • 726-6200 AREA 617

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

Elements 1.2 A
7.2
4.2 B

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

September 24, 1982

TO: Evaluation TEAM Leaders

FROM: The Over/Under Representation Project

RE: The 1982-1983 Action Plan -- Follow-up to September ETL In-service

During in-service conducted earlier this month, information was provided on the Project's 1982-1983 Action Plan and ETL's responsibilities during the current school year. Areas requiring ETL involvement were highlighted during the in-service. Additional follow-up information and materials are included with this memorandum.

Minority Student Placement Review - PFD Teams, chaired by the ETL, will review the folders for each black and Hispanic student newly placed in the 502.3 prototype during the 1981-1982 school year. All minority students in the 502.3 prototype should have been reviewed last year using the PFD Checklist; this procedure is only required for 502.3 minority students not previously reviewed with the PFD Checklist. The folder review will be conducted prior to the TEAM Meeting using the PFD Checklist. The revised PFD Checklist is enclosed. Also enclosed are the Spanish translation of the letter and response form for parents regarding minority representation at TEAM Meetings.

Data Reporting - The 2 page draft of this report form was distributed during the September in-service. Information on prototype movement is no longer required and we have deleted the second page of this report. The Over/Under Representation Project Monthly Data Management Report is only one page. ETL's must submit this report to the Over/Under Representation Project on the same date that Compliance Data Management Reports are due. The Data Management Report Form is enclosed. Additional copies, if needed, will be provided upon request. Please note that the "prereferral codes" listed in the SEIMS Manual can be utilized to save time and space.

Entrance and Exit Criteria - The final version of the Entrance/Exit Criteria form is enclosed (SEIMS 190). They are printed on NCR paper (3 copies). Routing instruction are printed on the bottom of these forms. A sheet listing commonly asked question and answers regarding the criteria has also been enclosed for your information. Additional copies of these forms will also be provided upon request.

26 COURT STREET • BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108 • 726-6200 AREA 617

Under Massachusetts law, Section 6, G.L. 71B, school systems are legally mandated to provide equal education opportunities to all students regardless of race, color or creed. In addition, P.L. 94-142, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and Massachusetts Law, Chapter 766, require that students be placed in the least restrictive setting based on non-culturally biased assessment procedures. Chapter 71B mandates school systems to develop a plan to rectify disproportionate placement. Boston Public Schools in 1978 was found to have a disproportionate number of black and Hispanic students in special education programs. Boston Public Schools, with the help of external and internal agencies and experts, developed a remedial plan now called the Action Plan to address the issue.

The Boston Public Schools share a problem endemic in all large, urban school systems of being overrepresented or underrepresented (disproportionate placement) with black and other minority students in some of the special education programs. Boston was cited four years ago for prima facie denial of equal educational opportunity for minority students in certain special education programs. Boston Public Schools has been cited for overrepresentation of black and Hispanic students in the 502.3 prototype. In addition, minority students are underrepresented in the 502.1 prototype and 502.5 prototype and 502.6 prototype. Hispanic students are additionally overrepresented in the 502.2 prototype. The Over/Under Representation Project, a state and federally funded project, examines the distribution of students based upon racial and linguistic characteristics. The Over/Under Representation Project was specifically designed to review, evaluate and recommend procedures and practices that would assure appropriate special education placement for all minority students. A major focus of the project is to provide technical assistance, inservice training, and information to major service providers to assist them in their decision-making for special needs students.

The Action Plan includes 9 elements. Under each element, Boston has specific responsibilities. The following includes an outline of each element and responsibilities of schools in each element.

Element 1

Minority Student Placement Review

For each newly placed minority 502.3 student (1981-1982) school year, the following procedure will need to be followed.

1) Each school will need to establish a team that includes an ETL, a minority representative, resource room teacher, and regular education teacher, who will review the 502.3 minority students utilizing the PFD (Prima Facie Denial) Checklist Sheet (see Appendix). All 502.3 minority students should have been reviewed last year using the PFD Checklist Sheet, this procedure is only required for 502.3 minority students not reviewed with the PFD Checklist Sheet.*

2) On-site visits will be made to schools during the 1982-1983 school year to randomly review student folders with the PFD Checklist Sheet. Random reviews will be conducted in schools where

    a) 1981-1982 (October to April) statistics indicate an increase of at least 3 minority students in the 502.3 prototype (see Appendix).

    b) 1981-1982 (October to April) statistics indicate an increase of at least 3 Spanish speaking students in the 502.2 prototype (see Appendix).

---

* Form letter for parents and response form included in Appendix.

In addition, random folder reviews will be conducted city-wide to review folders of students who have been in 502.2, 502.3, and 502.4 for more than 3 consecutive years.

Prereferral procedures will be examined in 3 schools that have increased minorities in the 502.1 prototype, and 3 schools that have decreased the placement of minority students in the 502.1 prototype (see Appendix for six selected schools).

Element 2

Identification of Primary Languages and Non-Biased Assessments

Lau identification for all bilingual special needs students will be continued in this school year. The utilization of appropriate assessment procedures for bilingual special needs students based on appropriate Lau category will also be continue

Element 3 and 6

Community Group Involvement and Parent Outreach

1) The Parent Information Assistance Resource Project will continue its outreach efforts during the current school year. The Over/Under Representation Project will continue to make presentations at community agencies.

2) Subcommittees on cultural awareness, parent outreach, and movement of minority students to less restrictive programs will continue to meet.

3) Three schools who indicate their interest in increasing parental attendence at 766 meetings will be selected this year. The project will work with these schools in developing activities to increase parental attendence.

Element 4

In- Service Plan

1) In-service workshops will be conducted by the Over/Under Representation staff between October and December. Schools' participation in this in-service will include:

   a) Schools that have increased the number of minority students in the 502.3 prototype by at least 3 during the 1981-1982 school year (see Appendix).

   b) Any school identified as overrepresented during the 1981-1982 school year who did not participate in last year's over/under representation workshops (West Roxbury High School, Lyndon, Hemenway, and Michelangelo).

   Two participants from the above schools will be expected to attend the workshops. They will then be expected to conduct and report on in-service conducted in their schools.

2) An account of participation in the ASSIST workshops will be kept by the project.

3) For any student referred to the CRU for recommended placement in a 502.4, 502.5, and 502.6 prototype, all Team members will complete a criteria checklist sheet that includes 40 items - A model that will be revised by the end of August based upon last year's pilot is included in the Appendix.

Element 5

Collaboration Between Bilingual and Special Education

The continuation of networks that have been established between bilingual and special education.

Element 7

Data Reporting

All schools and districts receive a chart twice a year on special education placements by prototype for minority students.

Data on referrals and prereferral activities on students moved to more restrictive special education prototypes is reported to the Department of Education. ETL's must submit monthly Data Management Report to the Over/Under Representation Project at same time Compliance Data Management Reports are due.

Element 8

Staffing

Boston reports any changes in minority special education staffing to State Department.

Element 9

District Monitor

Plan activities are monitored by the Assistant to the Superintendent.

Please contact the project if you would like a copy of Boston's Action Plan for the 1982-1983 school year. Idola Williams, Ronda Goodale at 726-6200, Extension 5955.

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

Dear Parent/Guardian:

The Boston Public Schools is responsible to ensure that each special needs student has the special education program that best meets his/her needs. In the past three years the Massachusetts Department of Education has been concerned that black and Spanish speaking students in the Boston Public Schools have not always been placed in programs that best meet their needs. They may have also remained in some special education programs that no longer meet their special needs.

Because of these concerns, we reviewed all black and Spanish speaking students placed in the 502.3 prototype with a minority representative present in the 1981-1982 school year. For each black student reviewed, a black educator was present at the meeting, and for each Spanish speaking student, a Spanish speaking representative was present at the meeting. During the 1982-1983 school year, we will review all minority students newly placed in the 502.3 prototype. A minority representative, a regular education teacher and a resource room teacher will be present at the review.

If you do not want this special review for your child, please send back the enclosed form to the Principal/Headmaster in your building.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this process, please telephone Idola Williams or Ronda Goodale, 726-6200, extension 5955. We will be glad to discuss the entire process with you. Thank you for your cooperation.

26 COURT STREET • BOSTON MASSACHUSETTS 02109 • 726-6200 AREA 617

PRIMA FACIE DENIAL CRITERIA CHECKLIST

School ________________ District ________________

Student ________________ I.D. # ________________

Race ________ Lau/Step ______ Prototype ________________

ETL ________________ Minority Representative ________________

Regular Education Teacher ________________ SPED Teacher ________________

Date ________________

	Yes	No	Date Criteria Met	Comments
Have all PFD Requirements been met?				
If not, answer A-I. Before proceeding with review with minority representation, all criteria must be met.				
A. Language dominance and proficiency testing completed prior to other testing for limited English proficient children.				
1MS 20 30 40 B. Prereferral modifications attempted and documented with results of each modification.				
C. Appropriate assessments conducted which were as free as possible from cultural and linguistics bias.				
D. Composition of the evaluation TEAM met requirements of sections 311.0, 312.0 and 313.0 (Refer to 766 Regulations pp. 19-21).				
E. Interpreter was present when primary language of parent or student was other than English.				
F. Forms and notices to parent were in primary language of parent.				
G. IEP included specific criteria for movement to less restrictive program.				
H. IEP and placement were based on the results of the assessments.				
I. Progress reports are prepared as required and show that child has made progress in achieving goals in IEP.				

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

Elements 1.2A
1.3, 4, 5A

January 12, 1983

TO: ETL's

FROM: Idola Williams, Ronda Goodale
Over/Under Representation Project

RE: 502.3 Reviews for Black and Hispanic Students

We are requesting that 502.3 Black and Hispanic students who were newly placed in this prototype last year and require a PFD team to review their records, be scheduled to be reviewed before March, 1983. Since all 502.3 Black and Hispanic students placed prior to last year were reviewed with minority representation, this should not involve many students.

The State Department is concerned that these reviews not be left to the end of the year; if anything is found to be incorrect by the team, there would be no time to correct the problem.

Please let us know if this request creates any problems for you.

Thank you for your professional cooperation.

eb

cc: Kenneth Caldwell
Patricia Crowley
Senior Level Advisors

SCHOOL DISTRICT Boston

COMPARISON OF SPECIAL EDUCATION ENROLLMENT RATES

acial roup	Total Enrollment	Special Education Enrollment		SPECIAL EDUCATION ENROLLMENT RATES													
				502.1		502.2		502.3		502.4		502.4(i)		502.5		502.6	
		Stds	Rate	Stds	Rate	Stds	Rate	Stds	Rate	Stds	Rate	Stds	Rate	Stds	Rate	Stds	Rate
LACK	29,411	6,622	(+.5) 22.5	504	7.6	2388	36.1	1477	(+4.2) 22.3	1,626	24.6	120	1.8	373	(-1.9) 5.6	23	(-.3) .3
SPANIC	8,930	1,670	18.7	84	(-2.5) 5.0	682	(+1.0) 40.8	374	(+4.3) 22.4	407	24.4	23	(-.3) 1.4	54	(-4.3) 3.2	6	(-.2) .4
HITE	20,792	3,818	18.4	359	9.4	1,267	33.2	576	15.1	1,036	27.1	79	2.1	359	9.4	25	.7

tes:

Enrollment figures are those reported on the October 1, 1982 School System Summary Report.

Special education enrollment rate equals number of students enrolled in special education divided by total enrollment times 100.

Prototype enrollment rate equals number of students in prototype divided by total number of students in special education; times 100.

Stds: number of students.

Substantial disproportionality.

5. Bilingual Education

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169
Bureau of Transitional Bilingual Education

Memo June 10, 1983

To: Jim Case, Associate Commissioner

From: Ernest J. Mazzone, Director

Re: Boston Consent Decree

As you requested I have done follow up research on the question of bilingual occupational education services to limited English speaking children in the city of Boston and whether they meet court orders per the Unified Plan and State law.

I spoke with Jim Caradonio, Director of Occupational Education, Boston Public Schools. He informed me that the data Charlie Glenn was anxious to have was submitted to the Division of Occupational Education under twenty five separate folders. He referred me to folder 15 dealing with bilingual services.

I spoke with Ralph Watson, Executive Assistant, Division of Occupational Education. He provided me with folder 15. I examined it. It contained information on the following set of questions.

A. List the total number of limited-English proficient students enrolled in occupational education programs at the high and middle school levels by dominant language.

B. List the teacher/counselor/aide/student ratio for each program.

C. Please provide a description of the type of instructional materials and equipment being utilized.

D. Please list all administrative positions that have been created that deal with the provision of instruction and services for bilingual students.

E. Please provide a list of bilingual programs, their locations and enrollments by sex and dominant languages.

F. Please list the total number of bilingual teachers, counselors and aides by school. Also, provide evidence that these staff have received pre-service and inservice training.

Answers to those questions are contained in the attached report submitted to the Division of Occupational Education by the Director of Occupational Education, Boston School Department. I have not included in attachment materials lists and policy manual for occupational education bilingual program. They are available in folder 15 referred to above.

I counted a total of 25 bilingual teacher, 9 bilingual counselors and 6 bilingual aides and assorted support personnel in 8 high schools (including HORC)serving 276 students. These is a citywide coordinator for bilingual occupational education. There is no assistant director of bilingual occupational education specified in the Unified Plan.

In the document 'Provisions for Bilingual Instruction in Vocational/ Occupational Programs' it states "During 1982-83 school year there has been nearly 3,000 bilingual students enrolled in vocational/occupational courses/programs". It hardly seems possible that the number of assigned staff (25 teachers, 9 counselors, 6 aides) would be able to meet the language instruction needs of these students. The 276 students designated as receiving bilingual support by the 25 teachers, 9 counselors and 6 aides are not necessarily receiving instruction in their native language.

A bilingual Spanish teacher at the HORC teaching auto mechanics may be dealing at one time with 5 students from 5 different language backgrounds. Consequently it appears to me that there is no structured match between skill development by a skills teacher, and the language medium needed to convey instruction to a limited English proficient student. Although there may be partial attention to language support instruction in some instances it seems more by chance than design.

I have to conclude that the bilingual vocational instruction is not being fully delivered in the Boston Public Schools in accordance with the Unified Plan and State Law.

encls.

cc: Charles Glenn

PROVISIONS FOR BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION IN VOCATIONAL/OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS

Our Core Mission states that,"Citywide bilingual services, including that at the Humphrey Center, will provide high quality bilingual instruction, skills training and all necessary additional support services for students of limited English proficiency to enable them to obtain gainful employment and/or further education."

During 1982-1983 school year there has been nearly 3,000 bilingual students enrolled in vocational/occupational courses/programs. We have exceeded the target population of 2,320 students specified in the Unified Plan.

At the Humphrey Center along we have noticed a 312% increase in the number of bilingual students in the past three years. (See attached documentation). Bilingual services have been constantly reevaluated and expanded to accommodate the growing bilingual population citywide. For example: East Boston High has expanded from six to ten voactional programs and their enrollment of bilingual students increased from 84 to 132. Their bilingual services will be further extended by sharing a part time Vietnamese paraprofessional from the Humphrey Center.

Language services have been expanded to cover previously areas of deficiency, e.g. native Spanish speaking business instructors are now assigned to Jamaica Plain and South Boston High Schools. Industrial Arts and Arts and Home Economic teachers have been hired.

However, bilingual support services in vocational education are no longer simply synonymous with Spanish/English language assistance.but now refledt the other linguistic minorities in the City of Boston: Chinese, Khmer, Laotian, Vietnamese, Portuguese, Cape Verdian, Italian and French. More bilingual staff and materials are being provided to assist students from these language groups.

In contrast to allegations that bilingual students are in fact "barred" from vocational/occupational programs, extensive recruitment has been carried out: a) Representatives from the Humphrey Center who are native speakers from target population have visited high schools and middle schools in an effort to encourage bilingual students to take advantage of opportunities in vocational education. b) Tours have been scheduled apecially for bilingual students. c) Counselors, teachers, ESL teachers, parents Bilingual Field Coordinators, and Community Based Organizations have received orientation to the programs and sites of vocational education in Boston. d) The radio and television media have also been used to recruit bilingual students.

The Humphrey Center has two bilingual counselors and also coordinates its guidance services with the bilingual guidance personnel from sending schools. With these combined forces, the students have the benefit of ten bilingual counselors.

Fourteen citywide field coordinators, representing every Boston Public Schools language population, are also important liaisons for our students, parents, teachers, and sending schools.

BILINGUAL COUNSELORS	SCHOOLS	BILINGUAL FIELD COORDINATORS	DISTRICTS
Carmen Janda	Brighton H. Taft M. Edison M.	Ramonita Diaz	I
Maria Nguyen	Brighton H. Edison M.	Tou Khang	I
Alberto Vazquez	Dorchester H. Cleveland M.	SophayySeng	I
	Charlestown H.	An Thai	I
Ana Bunker	Mackey Timilty Madison Park H.	Ana Rodríguez	II
Luis Torres	English H. Martin Luther King (at McCormack Middle or South Boston H.)	Pauline Tsoumas	III
		Evelio Rodríguez	V
Nancy Li	Charlestown H. Edwars M.	Raymond Georges	V
Dominic Avelaini	East Boston H. Unama Tech.H.	Norma Rodríguez	VI
	Barnes	Maria Gomes	VI
Linda Garden	Humphrey Center	Isabel Yee	VII
Carol Denker	Humphrey Center	Amelia Trinidad	VII
		Rosario Cascio	VIII
Jackie Nau	Dorchester H.	Félix Ibañez	IX
Jacqueline Murray (not bilingual)	"		

Unified Plan Report

SECTION IV A - E FOLDER #15

In response to the questions, the additional information is provided.

1. Provisions for Bilingual, etc. Insert A
2. Equipment
   All LESP students use the same equipment available to regular education students. There are no separate vocational laboratories or shops for LESP students. Instructional and safety materials are adapted into the native languages of LESP students.
3. The following administrative positions have been created:

   a) Bilingual Coordinator
   b) Bilingual Materials Development Specialist

   Other existing positions are currently occupied by certified bilingual educators:

   a) Director, Education and Employment
   b) Manager, Occupational Instructional Design

   The accompanying documentation also indicates the additional number of support staff for LESP students.

4. Boston has greatly exceeded the Court's order to provide "bilingual instruction..... in selected portions of the overall program." Enclosed is a copy of the Department of Education and Employment's Policy and Procedures for Bilingual Vocational Education.

395

BILINGUAL SUPPORT SERVICES

SCHOOL	PROGRAM	TEACHER(S)	BILINGUAL STUDENTS A.M.	P.M.	BILINGUAL COUNSELORS	BILINGUAL AIDES at HHH.ORC.
Brighton High	Auto Mechanics	Jaco, Ricardo	8		Janda, C.	Perez, H.
	Typing I Typing II	Lacet, F.	10			Basquiat, M.
Boston High	Work study		10			Darling, C.
Unama	General Food	Sison, L.	24		Dominic	Tran, J.
Mc Kinley	Graphics Art	Sales, L.	2			
	Building Maintenance	Espitia, R.	3			Am, Sophath
Boston Tech.	Machine Shop	Feliciano	2			Lopes, F.
HORC	Auto body Repair	Paez, C.	12	8	--	
	Data Processing	Suarz, R.	5	5	Lynda Garden	
	Bata Processing	Chin, K.	1	1	" "	
	Health Aide	Daley Carr, S.	3	1	" "	
	Med. Off., Clinical	Paz Lewis, M.	5	3	Carol Denker	
	Electronics	Barrios, F.	10	6	Juana Flores	
	"	Coloma, C.	11	5		
	Exploratory	Gonzalez, V.	24	20		
	Food Service	Kaufman, M.	9	9		
	Cosmetology	Murphy, C.	8	9		
	Auto Truck Repair	Arruda	7	2		
	"	Perreira	5	5		
	"	Pottenger, L.	5	6		
	Printing	De Castro, W.	5	6		
	SNAP	Hidalgo, E.	4	3	Ricardo Austrich	
	Building Maintenance Carpentry	Bartel, C.				
	Vocational ESL	Dolan, Ann				
South Boston H.	Business Lab.	Rivera, N.	1		Mendez, I.	
		Quellette	13			

SCHOOL	VOCATIONAL/OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS	PROVISIONS FOR BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION
Humphrey Center	Data Processing Graphics Commercial Design Printing Medical Office Assistant Fashion Design Nursing Assistant Carpentry Electricity Electronics Power Mechanics Special Needs Assessment Program(SNAP) Food Service Cosmetology Autobody Repair	-Bilingual Director,Education/Employment -Bilingual Vocational Coordinator -Bilingual Teachers (18) (486 students, 51 adults). - 2 Portuguese 2 Cape Verdian 12 Spanish 2 Chinese -8 bilingual Counselors (home school based). -A bilingual Manager Occupational Instructional Design -A bilingual Material Development Specialist -A bilingual Occupational Development Specialist -A bilingual Job Development Specialist -A bilingual Counselor Intern -Materials in the native language of the HORC student population -A bilingual Remedial Math Teacher in the SOS Lab. Cognitive Mapping Learning Styles adapted in Spanish, Vietnamese, Portuguese. -A Vocational ESL teacher -Five bilingual paraprofessionals Computerized Instruction Assistance Program to assess LEP students in Math and reading -Fourteen Community field Coordinators
Boston High	Work-study Program	- bilingual teachers; materials
Boston Technical H.	IA/Machine shop	-A bilingual teacher; materials.

SCHOOL	VOCATIONAL/OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAMS	PROVISIONS FOR BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION
Brighton High	Auto Mechanics	-Two Bilingual Instructors (8 students) -Individualized Assistance from home high school bilingual program in Vietnamese and Spanish. -Adapted materials in Vietnamese and Spanish is available at the Humphrey Center for this population. -A Vietnamese paraprofessional is available at the Humphrey Center for this population. -A Spanish and a Vietnamese counselor.
East Boston H.	Typing I Typing II Business Law Office Practice I Record Keeping I Record Keeping II Legal Med. Typing Computer Science Accounting I Accounting II	-ESL teacher (132 students) -Bilingual Counselor -Adapted Materials from the Humphrey Center for Vietnamese and Spanish students. A Vietnamese paraprofessional is available at the Humphrey Center. -A language Assessment Team.
Mc Kinley High	Building Maintenance Graphics Automotive	-Adapted materials for Spanish students (8 students) -A bilingual home based classroom. -Four bilingual teachers.
Jamaica Plain H.	Business	-One bilingual teacher -Adapted materials for Spanish students.
South Boston High	Business	-A bilingual teacher -Adapted materials from the Humphrey Center. -A Cambodian paraprofessional is available at the Humphrey Center. -A bilingual counselor.
	Home Economics	-A bilingual teacher.

LAW OFFICES OF
KEHOE, DOYLE, PLAYTER, NOVICK & STRIMAITIS
NINE HAMILTON PLACE BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108

ROBERT J. DOYLE
STEPHEN J. KEHOE
EDWARD BERKIN
CAROLINE B. PLAYTER
JURA STRIMAITIS
EMILY J. NOVICK
ELIZABETH A. RODGERS
JOAN LENINGTON
MARK BRONSTEIN

AREA CODE (617)
338-0070
LYNN OFFICE
599-8188

Received 4-11-83 CG.

April 8, 1983

Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity
Department of Education
1385 Hancock Street
Quincy, MA 02169

RE: Bilingual Programs

Dear Mr. Glenn:

Thank you for your response to my concerns regarding assignment issues. However, I did indeed learn about the expansion of the EDP's by a chance reading of the Sunday paper. Thereafter I telephoned the bilingual department and subsequently you telephoned me.

I remain concerned about various assignment related issues, although it is helpful to know the structure you have set up on the state level. I am concerned because although it appears that bilingual students may be better assigned to the HHORC, when they get there, it is my understanding, there is a plan to have cut needed bilingual aides violating the State Audit findings and recommendations, the Lau Plan and of course leading to a denial of equal educational opportunity. Similarly we have a small but important work study program at Boston High which again has been proposed for improper staffing cuts (see attached letter). Finally, in reading the School Committee Budget Subcommittee Report it appears the AWC classes are proposed for serious cut back or elimination if the supplemental budget is not approved, yet these are part of federal court order.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

Caroline B. Playter
CBP/cfk

cc: Steven Perlmutter
Marshall Simonds

Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

June 10th 1983

TO: Ernest Mazzone

FROM: Charles Glenn

RE: Non-Compliance Issues in Boston

Based on my review of the materials you received yesterday and gave me last evening, I believe the following non-compliance issues exist:

(1) There will be a serious shortage of teachers at certain schools; I cannot understand Mr. DeGruttola's statement that no additional teachers will be needed. It is true that there are 14 excess teachers and 14 missing teachers, but note that most of the excess teachers are not qualified to fill the vacancies, so far as I understand the bilingual program:

Excess (needed):	Elementary	Middle	High
Vietnamese		1	2
Chinese			1 (1)
French			7
Cape Verdean	(1)*		2
Italian	1		(2)
Cambodian	(1)*		
Spanish	(6)	(2)	(1)

[in these instances, why are teachers needed though no students have been assigned? See also the Hennigan . .]

I understand that Mr. DeGruttola is referring to budgeted positions, not to actual persons, but I assume that some or most of the "excess" positions are currently filled. Can we have confidence that every one of the needed positions will be filled with a person actually in the classroom the first day of school in September? My experience with the start-up on the Cambodian program taught me that months can pass while going through personnel process and other difficulties.

My analysis of the figures reveals that at least the following staff are needed, over present complement:

Brighton High	1 Spanish
Edison Middle	1 Spanish
Taft Middle	1 Spanish
Agassiz Elementary	1 Spanish
JFKennedy Elementary	3 Spanish
East Boston High	2 Italian
Mackey Elementary	1 Spanish

In addition, Mr. DeGruttola notes the need for 2.5 kindergarten teachers (minimum) for the expanded Extended Day Kindergarten program. Since we approved this expansion some months ago as an element of the desegregation plan, and approved student assignments more recently accordingly, I will be extremely concerned about any inability to implement fully in September.

(2) I take it that you agree with my suggestion that the size of bilingual clusters (with respect to Lau Plan requirements) be a matter for discussion and planning with the School Department, with appropriate involvement of the Master PAC. Such discussions should occur and reach a conclusion well before the space matrix for 1984 is presented for approval. Let me suggest that you take the lead to bring together the appropriate individuals, and that both John Coakley (or his designee) and I will need to be involved, to assure that any decisions support the desegregation plan.

(3) The issues raised by Mr. Rom and Mr. Galbiati have to do with assignment process. I take it that you have no conclusions about whether an appropriate process was followed, in a timely fashion. Since this is primarily an assignment issue, I will put it on my agenda for discussion with Mr. Coakley; I would appreciate any attachments which came with the letter.

(4) The issues raised by Attorney Caroline Playter in a letter which I sent to you at the end of April raise very substantive questions about staff at the Humphrey Occupational Resource Center. Have you had the opportunity to determine whether her charges are correct? I would suggest that we cannot wait for monitoring in the Fall to determine whether adequate support will be provided to limited English-speaking students at the ORC; if we find out now, we will be able to inform the Court (and the Superintendent) of any compliance problems, and thereby perhaps change what is available starting in September.

I call this to your special attention because the issue arises in the sections of the Report on Special Desegregation Measures and on Vocational/Occupational Education; it may be one of the most serious issues which emerges from the Report. We should be sure to have hard information and recommendations before the Report is approved by the Board in late June.

Let me note that staff of the Regional Center have worked quite closely with this issue.

cc. Jim Case
Marlene Godfrey
Bob Blumenthal
Frank Banks
Commissioner

404

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169
Bureau of Transitional Bilingual Education

Memo

To: Charles Glenn

From: Ernest J. Mazzone EJM

Re: Boston Consent Decree

Date: June 9, 1983

I made a trip to the Boston School Department today to get any updated data available for our review with respect to Boston's Compliance with Court Orders. I also reviewed Alan Rom's letter of 4-19-83 where he cites several violations of the Lau plan with respect to student assignments. (letter attached.) On this matter I was able to get the following documentation:

1) A list of bilingual program personnel by school assignment for FY-83 (9-82 to 6 83.) This gives us information on current staffing.

2) Classrooms assigned to bilingual program by language and school 1983-1984.

3) An analysis by the Boston Bilingual Department of students assigned vs. students projected per school. The first column of the analysis is the projected count by the D.I. by language, the second column is the actual student assignment by the D.I. by language per school, the third column gives the teacher assigned by language per school and the fourth gives the excess staff or needed staff per school for 1983-1984.

   If you study this analysis you will discover that there will be some potential program delivery problems in some schools where staff is needed. Consequently I must now conclude based on this evidence that unless corrective action is taken Boston will be in non-compliance in some schools. I have circled them on the analysis sheets.

4) The Boston Bilingual Department has requested Rosemarie Rosen, Deputy Superintendent take action to correct this situation. A memo to this effect dated May 26, 1983 from Raffael DeGrutola to Ms. Rosemarie Rosen spells out specific remedies to correct the problem. I believe it will be important for us to ensure that action is taken on this matter to prevent non-compliance with the state bilingual law (memo from Raffael DeGrutola to Rosemarie Rosen attached.)

On the issue of clusters and the assignments of students at a minimum number of 80, 80 and 100 per school at elementary, middle and secondary respectively we must have a legal ruling on the applicability of the voluntary Lau Plan being enforceable under the Court order.

If it is then certainly Boston would be out of compliance. You noted this in your own analysis of student assignments in your memo to me on April 28, 1983. I concur with you that this would be a serious compliance problem if not corrected since it does not meet the letter of the Voluntary Lau Plan.

There is no evidence provided that assignments that don't meet the Voluntary Lau Plan are educationally sound nor that decisions on this matter have been made with concerned parties like the Master PAC. (See letter from Alan Rom, Lawyer for the PAC.) to Raffael DeGrutola dated 2-14-83 on this matter which resulted from a complaint from Antonio Galbiate, Chairman, MPAC.

I believe Caroline B. Playter's concerns on this matter should also be addressed by Boston especially questions of equal access to Vocational programs. (letter to you dated 4-8-83.) attached.

cc: J.Case

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
CITYWIDE BILINGUAL PROGRAMS

435

May 26, 1983

MEMORANDUM

SENIOR ADVISOR
RAFFAEL DeGRUTTOLA

received
TB& Bureau
6-9-83

TO: Rosemarie Rosen, Deputy Superintendent
Finance and Administration

FROM: Raffael DeGruttola, Senior Advisor RGD
Citywide Bilingual Programs

RE: BILINGUAL STUDENT ASSIGNMENTS -
EFFECT ON BUDGETED TEACHER'S POSITIONS

This office based its recommended staffing plan on the enrollment projections of the D. I. Because of the difference between the number of students projected and the number of students assigned, many budgeted slots will have to be adjusted by means of budget transfers. The chart below indicates the excess or deficit schools and positions.

Excess

	D. I. Proj.	D. I. Assg.	(+)	
Brighton	125V	89V	2.0V	
Edison	56V	46V	1.0V	
Charlestown	196C	145C	1.0C	
English	285F	187F	7.0F	
Madison	167K	147K	2.0K	
McKay (EDP)	5I	--	1.0I	161
Total			+14.0	(161) & (191)

Deficit

	D. I. Proj.	D. I. Assg.	(-)	
Brighton	60S	86S	1.0S	
Edison	63S	83S	1.0S	
Taft	49S	55S	1.0S	
Agassiz	189S	190S	1.0S	
J.F.Kennedy	128S	169S	3.0S	
Condon	--	--	1.0K	
Tynan	--	--	1.0R	
E. Boston	107I	130I	2.0I	
Boston	0C	8C	1.0C	
Mackey	82S	93S	1.0S	
Hennigan	--	--	1.0S	
Total			-14.0	(191)

At present no additional bilingual teachers (Grs. 1-12) will be needed. However, with the assignment of students to expansion EDP sites, we will need a minimum of 2.5 kindergarten teachers.

Please advise me regarding the redeployment of teaching staff both for kindergarten and grades 1-12.

/k

cc: David Whall
Yvonne Iturrino

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169
Bureau of Transitional Bilingual Education

Mazzone

Memo

To: *Jim Case*

From: *Ernest J. Mazzone*

Re: *Monitoring Boston Consent Decree*

Date: *June 1, 1983*

Following receipt of Dr. Charles Glenn's memo of 5-27-83 I called him to explain the basis of my monitoring report on Boston's Consent Decree. I explained to him that my report of 5-24-83 was based on a desk audit using criteria established jointly by the regional office and the Bureau of Transitional Bilingual Education on issues related to Court Ordered Desegregation. Charlie informed me he didn't have a copy of the Criteria and consequently his confusion in understanding my report. I shall submit a copy to him.

As stated in my report of May 24, 1983 there are five monitoring objectives, the first, second, and fourth of which deal with assignments. In my review of the assignment documents there were no critical educational problems with the proposed assignments. In the past we have had some problems with Charlestown High, but based on my conversations with Boston officials the situation should be stabilized for September 1983. The Bureau will be keeping its eye on this and other situations like this that may be potential problem areas.

As stated in my May 24, 1983 memo the Boston School Department has conformed with monitoring objective III by having application booklets printed in ten languages and in English.

I treated monitoring objective five in great detail for it relates to the substance of program services to limited English proficient students. This objective is based on the Consent Decree statement that the Boston School Department is expected to meet state requirements to provide transitional bilingual education to limited English proficient children. My findings in this area are that Boston plans to follow its commitment to execute the Voluntary Law Plan which encompasses state transitional bilingual education requirements. I have no evidence to the contrary. Again as in the past the Bureau will continue to examine potential trouble spots to ensure that adequate teaching staffs are assigned to specific schools before the opening of school.

Although my desk audit indicated no extraordinary compliance issues at the time, nevertheless we will continue to be vigilant in ascertaining that state and federal requirements continue to be met.

cc: Charles Glenn

:gs

Division of Curriculum and Instruction
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

Bureau of Transitional Bilingual Education

Memo

To: Jim Case

From: Ernest J. Mazzone

Re: Monitoring Criteria Boston Consent Decree

Date: March 30, 1983

The purpose of this monitoring process in the Boston Public Schools is to determine the degree of compliance with Court orders in the desegregation of bilingual education programs in the city schools.

The following monitoring objectives based on court orders in the desegregation of bilingual programs will be carried out by the regional office bilingual program staff under the direction of the regional office director and the program supervision of the director, Bureau of Transitional Bilingual Education.

1. To determine that "bilingual kindergarten programs shall be provided when 20 or more kindergarten students attend a school." (Student Desegregation Plan, May 10, 1975, P4-5.)

2. To verify that "the bilingual department staff will make decisions on assigning students to programs and the assignment unit will assign to schools" (Student desegregation plan, March 21, 1978, P-5)

3.1 To verify "The School Department shall, under the court's supervision prepare an "Orientation and Application Booklet."

3.2 The booklet shall be printed for mailing in an English and Spanish version and in a Chinese version

3.3 The English-Spanish version shall be mailed to the parents or guardians of all students enrolled in the public schools.

3.4 The Chinese version shall be mailed to the parents or guardians of students identified from enrollment lists as Oriental

3.5 Translations into French, Greek, Italian and Portuguese shall be printed for distribution

3.6 Copies of the booklet in these languages as well as in English-Spanish and Chinese shall be made available at local schools, community school district offices and at other municipal locations.

3.7 A statement in each language shall appear in the English-Spanish booklet mailed to parents and students informing them of the availability and location of copies in these languages.

3.8 The orientation section of the booklet shall present brief but cogent descriptions of all the schools and their programs within Citywide Districts 9 and shall orient readers accurately to school resources and to the range of options and restrictions governing final assignments.
(Student Desegregation Plan, May 10, 1975.)

4. To ascertain the percentage of black and Hispanic students entering classes at Boston Latin School, Boston Latin Academy and Boston Technical High School and the extent to which it reaches the 35% mark ordered in September 1975.

To ascertain how admissions criteria were determined and to what intent SSAT^{s} and grade point averages factor into the criteria.

To ascertain any modifications to the above orders and the rationale for said modifications.

To ascertain how the School Department institutes and conducts programs to (a) make all students in the system aware of the admission requirements and type of instruction offered in the examination schools, and (b) to recruit black and Hispanic applicants to the examination schools in the future. (Student Desegregation Plan, May 10, 1975, P.48-49)

5. To verify that children in need of bilingual instruction are being provided said instruction in accordance with state law.

The following significant features shall be verified

5.1 Appropriate identification,placement and transfer

5.2 Pupil progress reports are maintained and sent to parents in the native language on a regular basis

5.3 Personnel employed in TBE are certified

5.4 The school district provides the following personnel

5.4.1. bilingual teachers, native language/ESL
5.4.2 program supervisor and adequate program administration
5.4.3 pupil teacher ratio and age span meets state regulation.

5.4.4 student assignments facilitate integration

5.4.5 physical conditions comparable to other classes

5.4.6 communication to parents in English and the native language

5.4.7 annual in house review conducted

5.4.8 PAC represented on review team

5.4.9 students are not mainstreamed prematurely; mainstreaming complies with G.L. C.71A, section 2, regulation 23.)

5.4.10 students English languages skills evaluated for placement and transfer purposes.

5.4.11 pupils eligible for TBE are placed in the program. Placement procedures follow C 71A, reg. section 8.

5.4.12 parents are informed of child enrollment in TBE in accordance with C 71A, Reg. section 45.

5.4.13 TBE students tested annually in English skills

5.4.14 students are enrolled in TBE for three years or until English proficiency is adequate to compete successfully in regular class

5.4.15 transfer out of TBE is based on examinations of English skills and approved by parents

5.4.16 if 20 or more limited English speaking students of one linguistic group reside in Boston and are enrolled in school a TBE program of instruction will be provided

5.4.17 if fewer than 20 in a linguistic group reside in Boston then equal access to instruction must be provided

5.4.18 a full time TBE program of instruction is provided to eligible students,

a) all courses required by law and the school district taught in English and the native language
b) native language arts
c) English language arts
d) courses in the history and culture of the students background
e) courses in the history and culture of the U.S.

5.4.19 TBE students have equal access to extra-curricular activities

5.4.20 TBE students have equal access to Title I, SPED, Occ. Education Services, counseling and other support services

5.4.21 meaningful involvement of parents in accordance with regulations 38-42

PROCESS TO IMPLEMENT MONITORING OBJECTIVES

BOSTON ROLE AND STATE ACTIVITY

Object

1. Boston Submits to GBREC

   1. Lists of all LEP kindergarten children
   2. Lists of schools where LEP children have been assigned
   3. Pupil teacher ratio of kindergarten classes with type of teacher providing instruction (Chinese bilingual, Laotian bilingual, etc.)
   4. Lau status report prepared by local Lau review team
   5. Maintain (for on-site review) bilingual students weekly schedules

State Activity

1. Review lists and other documentation to ascertain compliance with state regulation
2. Verify compliance with a minimum of 1 visit to critical school programs to observe and discuss problem areas and review students schedules
3. Consult with the director, bureau of EEO regarding assignment issues
4. Confer with staff of Boston Bilingual Department on problem areas
5. Consult with Director, State Bureau TBE on problem areas
6. Report to appropriate parties in SEA to exact compliance.

Object

2 Boston Submits to GBREC

1. Lists of bilingual extended day enrollees
2. Lists of schools where enrolled
3. Maintain daily student schedules

State Activity

1. Review documentation for compliance with State Law.
2. Visit critical extended day kindergarten programs and review daily schedules.
3. Consult and report as above with other SEA staffs and Boston personnel

Object

3 Boston Submits to GBREC

1. Drafts of orientation and application booklets in English, Spanish, Chinese, French, Greek, Italian and Portuguese version.
2. Brief distribution and dissemination plan for complying with this count order.

State Activity

1. Review drafts of orientation booklets to ensure compliance with court order
2. Review adequacy of dissemination plan
3. Visit district offices and local schools in the district to verify distribution of booklets and their availability in appropriate locations
4. Consult and report with other appropriate SEA and Boston staffs.

Object

4 Boston Submits to GBREC

1. Admissions criteria and related documents
2. Recruitment material and strategies
3. Any other notices sent to parents and any other documents pertinent to the court order.

Obj.4(cont')

State Activity

1. Analyze appropriateness of criteria and other documentations such as strategies and procedures used to implement the Court order and selection of students to enter advanced work/academically talented and gifted classes
2. Check if notices have been sent to parents in native language attesting child has been selected to go to AWC/ATG classes
3. Observe its implementation through interviews with school people, students, parents and others. For example, interview teachers and students in grade four where there are TBE students to ensure they have been properly informed

Object 5 Boston Submits to GBREC

1. Program plan and Letter of Intent in accordance with regulations 50 and 51 M.G.L. C. 71A.
2. Annual Lau (local level) program review report.
3. Current modifications to program plan
4. Current TBE enrollment listings by language schools, grades, ages, classes and teachers and language capability of teachers
5. Maintain daily student schedules

State Activity

1. Analyze appropriateness of Plan and current modification
2. Analyze current TBE enrollments to ascertain compliance with ratios, clustering, age span, and appropriateness of placements
3. Visit critical school programs to ensure compliance with significant mandated features of State TBE law
4. Consult and report to appropriate SEA and Boston school personnel

In addition to bilingual monitoring objectives cited above which fall under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Transitional Bilingual Education and the regional office there are other bilingual court orders which will be monitored directly by the Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity, the Division of Special Education and the Division of Occupational Education.

The Bureau of Transitional Bilingual Education staff will provide technical assistance to those units on bilingual related matters and will consult and report as needed to appropriate personnel in those units. Specifically they are.

1. Assignments of bilingual education classes - (memo and orders modifying Desegregation Plan, May 6, 1979 p.23) - Charles Glenn — Charles Glenn
2. Transfers on medical grounds to an from bilingual or special education classes - — Charles Glenn
3. Disproportionate isolation
   a) student desegregation plan, May 10, 1975, P.70
   b) memo modifying desegregation plan, May 6, 1977) Charles Glenn
4. Unified Plan, Occupational Education (Student Desegregation Plan, May 10, 1975). — Dave Cronin, Marlene Godfrey

cc: Marlene Godfrey
Charles Glenn

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

Bureau of Transitional Bilingual Education

Memo

To:	Charles Glenn
From:	Ernest J. Mazzone
Re:	Monitoring Boston Consent Decree
Date:	May 24, 1983

I *Monitoring Area*

A. Transitional Bilingual Education

B. Methodology for all objectives in this report is the same

1) Desk Audit by E.J. Mazzone
2) Mr. Mazzone interviewed Rafael DeGruttola and Mr. Peter Murray, Boston Public School, Bilingual Department
3) Documents and data submitted to Mr. Mazzone as requested
4) Analysis and observations of data by E.J. Mazzone

II *Objectives I and II*

Mazzone collaborated with Charles Glenn on analysis of assignments. Mazzone conducted Desk Audits with Rafael DeGruttola and Peter Murray on Assignments. The documents reviewed conformed with Court order.

III *Objective III*

1) • Orientation and Application Booklets printed in ten languages and conform in all respects with Court Order.

2) • Interviewees state that documents are properly disseminated in local school etc, in accordance with criteria 3.6. Regional staff will physically verify before July 31, 1983.

IV *Objective IV*

Charles Glenn verifies with Implementation Office and consultation with Mazzone.

V *Objective V* Bilingual Program conforms with State Law.

418

Objective V (cont')

5.1 Appropriate ID, and Placement is part of voluntary Lau Plan in place.

5.2 Pupil progress reports in native languages in place. Observed by E.J. Mazzone.

5.3 Certification status of teacher being verified by regional staff. Completed by July 31, 1983.

5.4 Personnel

5.4.1 Boston Public Schools is providing bilingual teachers, native language/ESL.

5.4.2 Regional office staff verifying match between pupil assignments and

5.4.3 Teacher assignments to be completed by July 31, 1983. Mr. Mazzone visually check printouts of assignments documents to be used for analysis.

5.4.4 Assignments facilitate integration - C. Glenn verifies.

5.4.5 Physical facilities comparable to other classes. Mazzone desk audit verified comparability. This must be observed in September to ensure compliance.

5.4.6 Communications are in native language. Mazzone observed booklets, reports and special materials in the languages.

5.4.7 Annual in house review was conducted. Report submitted to SEA.

- Major problems were identified and listed
- Follow up with principals to remedy issues through May, 1983.
- Forms being developed to assess compliance on a monthly basis and filled out by coordinators as they visit schools (Mazzone Desk Audit.)

This issues will be continually monitored during the next school year.

5.4.8 PAC was represented on review team - signators.

5.4.9 Procedures in Lau Plan are followed but with some problems still existing in mainstreaming as per review. SEA/Regional office will continue to provide technical assistance on the issues.

5.4.10 Students are tested for placement and transfer. Part of problems still remains with mainstreaming remedies are being applied. There has been an improvement from 34% to c. 20% on numbers of students in Transitional Bilingual Education more than 3 years.

5.4.11 Lau procedures and home language survey functioning well.

5.4.12 Parents are notified of assignments to Transitional Bilingual Education via booklets.

5.4.13 Students are tested annually in English.

Several batteries are used: a) Cloze Test in English developed locally and validated; b) College Board Degrees of Reading Power given to all students; c) some take Metropolitan.

5.4.14 Students are given at least 3 year T.B.E. as required.

5.4.15 Transfer to mainstream follows Lau plan. Language assessments teams met to make decisions on transfers. There is a language assessment team handbook in several languages to help school personnel and parents in the process. Procedure is commendable.

5.4.16 Boston Public Schools policy follow state T.B.E. regulations. Whenever there are 20 or more in a language classification Transitional Bilingual Education is instituted.

5.4.17 Where there are fewer than 20 in a language classification equal access is provided.

- For multilingual classes in ESL with native language aides when available the following sites are provided:
  Elementary - Hennigan
  Middle - M.L. King
  H.S. - English

5.4.18 Full time Transitional Bilingual Education is provided as per regulation 20. The check points are contained in the Lau Plan to ensure that adequate native language instruction is going on. Schedules are kept on students. Information is being computerized for easier analysis. This will be continually observed during 1983-84 school year by regional office staffs.

5.4.19 Transitional Bilingual Education students have equal access to extra-curricular activities. No problems identified in this area.

5.4.20 Transitional Bilingual Education students have access to Title I, Special Education, Occupational Education Services, Counseling and other support services.

- $370,000 of Title I is used for supplementary ESL. There are 12 ESL/ Title I teachers giving service.

- There are 8 bilingual guidance counselors in Spanish, Italian, Vietnamese, Cape Verdean, Chinese and Haitian. There is need for Cambodian. Major languages are covered. SEA regional staffs will monitor this in 83-84 school year.

5.4.21. There is meaningful involvement of parents per regulations 38-42.

- 12 Sub- Pacs meet monthly. Master PAC meets on need. PAC^s are functioning.

In summary the desk audits conducted by Ernest J. Mazzone revealed no glaring non-compliance issues. There are operational issues to be resolved and the GBREC staff under the direction of Ernest J. Mazzone will continue monitoring compliance with the order.

cc: Marlene Godfrey, GBREC
Franklin Banks
James Case

:gs

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Analysis of 1983 Boston Student Assignments: Alan Rom's Concerns

In a letter dated April 19, 1983 to Dr. Oliver Lancaster, Attorney Alan Jay Rom raised concerns about the proposed student assignment plan on behalf of the Bilingual Master Parents Advisory Council. Although this group is not a party to the desegregation case, we are naturally concerned to treat any issue which they raise with the utmost care. I have talked with Mr. Rom twice about the problems raised in his letter, and have prepared a memorandum to Ernest Mazzone reviewing the facts and suggesting a strategy for dealing with these problems.

The essential difficulty is that several bilingual programs enroll fewer students than required by the Voluntary Lau Plan, an agreement between the Master PAC and the Boston School Committee. While state law and regulations do not create the same requirement (and we have no responsibility to enforce the Lau Plan), it is good educational sense and a rule-of-thumb of the Bureau of Transitional Bilingual Education to seek to concentrate bilingual students in large enough "clusters" to assure an adequate program. This is particularly critical at the high school level, where a diversity of educational specialties must be offered to provide students in a bilingual program an educational experience comparable to that of students who are not in such a program.

As detailed in my April 23, 1983 memorandum to Mr. Mazzone (which I will not repeat here), there are in particular a number of Spanish bilingual programs in high schools which enroll fewer than 100 students each. Using projections for Fall 1983:

Brighton High	84
Jamaica Plain High	112
Dorchester High	75
South Boston High	57
Charlestown High	65

Boston High		42
English High		57
Madison Park High		77
Total	569	
average	71	

It is clear that with eight programs and only 569 students, most programs cannot meet the 100 student minimum. Since no evidence has been presented that a significant number of Spanish-dominant students are not being served by high school bilingual programs, the only choices are (a) to accept a smaller enrollment than the "ideal", with concomittant costs but also perhaps advantages of pupil/teacher ratio; or (b) to consolidate at five or six high schools rather than eight.

I have suggested that Mr. Mazzone work with Boston bilingual program staff - and encourage them to involve the Master PAC - to develop program recommendations for the Spanish high school programs. If these recommendations would require moving or consolidating programs, there would then need to be a review by Mr. Coakley and by me, and possibly formal negotiations of a modification of the student assignment plan.

Note, in this connection, the relation between these bilingual program arrangements and the current proposals to restructure secondary education in a radical manner; no hasty steps should be taken which might require moving students a second time in 1984-85. At the same time, it would be appropriate to consider placement of a Spanish bilingual program in a technical school, an "international" school, or a classical high school, for academically talented Hispanic students.

Charles L. Glenn, Director
May 10th 1983

6. Vocational and Occupational Education

MONITORING REPORT

UNIFIED PLAN FOR VOCATIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

PREPARED BY GREATER BOSTON REGIONAL EDUCATION CENTER
OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION TEAM

MAY 19, 1983

MONITORING REPORT

UNIFIED PLAN FOR VOCATIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

INTRODUCTION

In its modified order of September 25, 1975, the United States District Court incorporated the "Unified Plan for Vocational and Occupational Education in the City of Boston" as part of the court's May 10, 1975 School Desegregation Plan. The Unfified Plan was filed with the court on September 8, 1975 and amended on January 28, 1978. The purpose of this monitoring process in Boston Public Schools is to determine the degree of compliance with the Unified Plan for Vocational and Occupational Education in the City of Boston.

The Unified Plan for Vocational and Occupational Education includes eight (8) major areas: (1) compliance with relevant state laws and regulations; (2) district core programs; (3) magnet programs; (4) in-school bilingual; (5) out-of-school youth, ages 16-21; (6) vocational/occupational education for special needs students; (7) program changes; and (8) program support components. Each component of the Plan contains a set of activities for improving vocational/occupational education that must be implemented. The ultimate objective of the monitoring process is to determine the extent to which each activity listed in the Plan has been accomplished.

The monitoring process has involved two major steps: (1) data collection and (2) data analysis. Data collection has been done through a data collection instrument (see exhibit A) to which Boston Public Schools has responded with information and supportive documentation. The data were compiled, reviewed and analyzed by the Occupational Education Team staff of the Greater Boston Regional Education Center. The monitoring team consists of Naisuon Chu, Mimi Jones, Sylvia Rosario and Therese Alston. In some instances, on-site visits were conducted for the purpose of verification, clarification and obtaining additional information. Where applicable, interdivisional collaboration and cross-checking have been done with the Special Education and Transitional Bilingual Education staff of the Regional Center.

Conclusions have been drawn about the status of compliance with the Unified Plan based upon this monitoring process. A Data Analysis Report (see exhibit B) which delineates individual specifications of the Unified Plan, provides comments regarding the status of compliance of each individual item and recommendations for corrective action has been compiled. Narrative summaries which highlight the monitoring objectives of the status of compliance of each of the eight (8) major areas included in the Unified Plan follow.

NARRATIVE SUMMARIES

I. COMPLIANCE WITH RELEVANT STATE LAWS

The Unified Plan specifies that in addition to mandates contained in the court order, the vocational and occupational education programs in the City of Boston must conform as well to State Law and pursuant regulations in regard to equal access. Enrollments in all vocational and occupational programs will reflect the racial and sexual ratios established by the court for the citywide schools.

Boston Public Schools are not in compliance with balanced enrollments based on race and sex. Considering the range of variation as established by the

Student Desegregation Plan, disproportionate enrollments based on race are noted in programs at 13 high schools and 16 middle schools. Female students are consistently underrepresented in programs non-traditional for their sex at 13 high schools and males are underrepresented in programs non-traditional for their sex at 10 of these 13 high schools. These imbalances are found at the same schools where we would find racial imbalances with the exception of the middle schools.

II. DISTRICT CORE PROGRAMS

The Unified Plan specifies that middle schools exploratory clusters and career education will be required for all students. High Schools will offer employability skills for general students and exploratory clusters for 9th to 12th graders with only 9th grade being mandatory for all students.

A. Exploratory Clusters (Middle and High Schools)

Most middle schools do offer exploratory clusters in grades 6, 7, and 8 in the Industry Related and Food-Home-Services-Health Related Clusters. However, only three schools, according to the data submitted and information verified, offer the Business-Distribution-Government Related Cluster.

High school exploratory clusters were primarily offered in the Business-Distribution-Government Related and the Food-Home-Health-Services Related Cluster. Programs in these 2 clusters were generally Home Economics and Business Education. Eight high schools no longer offer the Industry Related Cluster as exploratory. Teacher layoffs account for most of the reductions in the area and more program closings and layoffs in this area are scheduled for 9/83.

B. Employability Skills Clusters (High Schools)

All of the high schools offer Business-Office Education as an employability cluster. None of the high schools, with the exception of the ORC offer Food-Home-Health-Services Related as an employability cluster. Distributive Education Program were closed in 6 high schools, but offered in all of the other high schools.

III. MAGNET PROGRAMS

The Unified Plan specified that magnet vocational and occupational education progams in Boston will include: a central occupational resource center, ORC statellite programs, and magnet programs in the new high schools.
The ORC is operational. However, its enrollment is at 71% capacity. Three of the 4 new magnet programs to be implemented have been implemented. Jamaica Plain High is the only high school totally out of compliance with regard to magnet programs.

IV. IN-SCHOOL BILINGUAL

One of the objectives of the Unified Plan is to serve limited English proficient students through Bilingual Vocational/Occupational programs and administrative, counseling and instructional support services. Bilingual Vocational/Occupational Education programs are non existent. All limited English proficient (LEP) students are mainstreamed into regular vocational/occupational programs. The total number of students currently mainstreamed into regular vocational/occupational programs at the middle and high schools exceeds the targeted number of LEP students specified by the plan. It should be noted that the projected enrollments were based on 1975 statistics. The mainstreaming approach is coordinated by a Coordinator for Bilingual Voca-tional Education. Several provisions exist for providing counseling and instructional support to mainstreamed LEP students. Instructional support services include six (6) aides at the HHORC, Multi-media instructional materials in several native languages, and Bilingual Field Coordinators that function as liaisons for students, parents, teachers, and sending schools. Two salient concerns relate to the teacher/student and counselor/student ratios. The General Foods program at the Umana High has a ratio of one teacher to twenty-four (24) LEP students without the assistance of an aide. The HHORC has one Bilingual Counselor in relationship to a total of four hundred and seventy-four mainstreamed LEP students.

In the absence of Bilingual Vocational/Occupational Education programs, it is evident that Boston Public Schools has made efforts to provide access to vocational/occupational programs to limited English proficient students.

V. OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH, AGES 16-21

The implementation of programs to serve out-of-school youth, ages 16-21, as specified by the Unified Plan has been facilitated by the City of Boston through its CETA Prime Sponsor. The Prime Sponsor currently provides a broad range of program services to out-of-school youth. These activities include recruitment/outreach, referral, assessment, counseling, pre-employment, and education and employability skills programs. In addition to these activities, the Prime Sponsor engages in several collaborative and coordination efforts with the Boston Public Schools through representation on advisory and planning groups. Evidence indicates that the Boston CETA Prime Sponsor continues to provide services to this segment of the population. Given the transitional state of the CETA Prime Sponsor vis-a-vis the newly enacted Job Training Partnership Act, the continuation of services to out-of-school youth must be closely monitored.

VI. VOCATIONAL/OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION FOR SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS

The Unified Plan designates that career awareness, exploratory and occupational skills development programs must be designed and made available to all students with special needs in program prototypes of 502.1 through 502.11b. In response to this mandate, the Boston Public Schools System has made significant achievements in instituting procedures and provisions for the comprehensive delivery of vocational/occupational educational services to special needs students. The level of program services, including pre-vocational, skills training programs and a variety of support services, has expanded beyond that specified by the Unified Plan. The one area that must be strengthened is to provide staff development training in understanding and dealing with special needs students to all vocational/occupational instructors throughout the system.

VII. PROGRAM CHANGES AND DELETIONS

While the emphasis in the Unified Plan has been on expansion and revision, some courses and programs would be deleted or phased out. All proposed program deletions and transfers have been completed as specified by the Unified Plan with the following exceptions: The Machinist program at East Boston High and Upholstery/Furniture and Finishing/Cabinet Making programs at Dorchester High have not been transferred to the Humphrey Occupational Resource Center. Appropriate action must be taken to complete all program transfers.

VIII. PROGRAM SUPPORT COMPONENTS

In order to achieve the immediate and long-range plans for/vocational/occupational education in the city of Boston, the Unified Plan delineated several important supporting or facilitating efforts that must be modified, revised or instituted. The Plan provides a detailed scheme for (1) management modifications, (2) public information, (3) professional and inservice development, (4) curriculum revision, and (5) industry/agency/community involvement. The implementational status of each of these elements is discussed below.

1. Management Modifications

Boston Public Schools has not instituted a distinctive management structure which accounts for an effective vocational/occupational education delivery system as specified by the Unified Plan. A management structure which, by nature and intent, can account for an articulated, quality vocational/occupational delivery capability, systemwide must be instituted.

2. Public Information

Current public information efforts regarding vocational/occupational education programs in the Boston Public Schools do not entail all of the components and impact focus specified by the Unified Plan. The Public information campaign has been conducted through a variety of activities including Humphrey Center Open House, program slide-tape presentations, assignment booklets, brochures and Humphrey Center Newsletter disseminated to school personnel, the general public, community organizations, and others having direct or indirect impact influence upon students and potential enrollees. Some public relations efforts regarding the Humphrey Center have been accomplished through the Advisory Committees, periodic Electronic Media coverage, and through Loaned Business Executives who market the Center to business and community groups. The implementation of a systematic, aggressive and pervasive public information campaign is vital to the vocational/occupational education system in Boston. It should be geared to making the greatest impact on the appropriate target groups. This can best be achieved through the appointment of a full-time, experienced Public Information Officer by Boston Public Schools to coordinate and carry out this function and objective.

3. Professional and Inservice Development

There is evidence that staff development training programs which are geared to equal educational opportunity, special needs instruction, and bilingual instruction have been provided to some degree at the Humphrey Occupational Resource Center. What is not evident is that those training provisions have included all vocational/occupational instructors throughout the system.

4. Curriculum Revision

Significant progress has been made in the area of curriculum improvement. Boston Public Schools has engaged in a series of vocational curriculum improvement activities. Currently, efforts are directed toward the development of a full-scale Personalized Competency-Based Vocational Curriculum for all programs at the Humphrey Center and selected programs at other schools.

5. Industry/Agency/Community Involvement

Industry Agency and Community Involvement in the implementation of vocational/occupational education in Boston is being accomplished in a variety of ways. One of the primary means is through the role of the Advisory Council for Career and Occupational Education (ACCVOE). The ACCVOE is functioning as required by Chapter 74 Regulations and specified by the Unified Plan. The one area of non-compliance relates to the membership composition of the ACCVOE. The composition of the Council does not consist of a representative of Special Education, a parent (through CPAC), a student representative, and one third (1/3) Black membership. The membership must be modified to comply with the specified target groups as stated in the Unified Plan. Finally, the far-reaching results and positive impact of the Unified Plan in the City of Boston can only be realized through a comprehensive and responsive job development and placement component based upon current manpower demand, system capabilities, and student capability/interests. The Humphrey Occupational Resource Center has a comprehensive job development and placement in place. However, this same system is not fully implemented citywide.

CONCLUSION

There are crucial points that must be made about the presumption of the Unified Plan and its relationship to current efforts that are being made by Boston Public Schools and the Division of Occupational Education to improve and provide quality vocational/occupational education to students in the City of Boston.

1. The Unified Plan for Vocational/Occupational Education was develop in 1975 and revised in 1978. The rationale for planning, both in terms of capacity projections and program development, was based upon needs assessments at that time. There is a need to revise and update this document to reflect current enrollment patterns, changes and needs of Boston Public Schools.

2. Subsequent to the development of the Unififed Plan, the Division of Occupational Education conducted a comprehensive evaluation of Vocational/Occupational Education programs in Boston in 1980, and in 1982 conducted a Chapter 74 Audit of the Humphrey Occupational Resource Center. Comprehensive recommendations for the improvement of programs were provided to Boston as a result of the findings of these audits. In response to these recommendations, Boston has developed plans for remedial action. Significant improvements and developments have been made in several of the areas cited by the audits. These improvements have been monitored and documented through the on-going monitoring responsibilities of the Occupational Education Team of the Greater Boston Regional Education Center.

3. This report is based primarily on data available from Boston Public Schools at the present time. The required information has not been provided in some areas, and is incomplete in others. Best judgements have been made in conclusions that have been draws within the context of this limitation.

4. Close and frequent examination of program quality and implementation will continue to be conducted on site as a part of the on-going monitoring responsibilities of the Division of Occupational Education.

Exhibit A

Unified Plan for Vocational/Occupational Education

Monitoring Instrument

Section I. Compliance with Relevant State Laws and Regulations

A. Please provide a list of all vocational programs by school with enrollments by sex and race and need.

B. Please list all vocational programs that contain provisions for bilingual instructions. Also, list the provisions.

C. Please provide a list of students that applied for vocational programs, the programs to which they applied and the programs to which they were assigned.

D. Please describe the procedures utilized when a program is oversubscribed. List programs that are oversubscribed and the number of students by sex, race and need that are selected through the oversubscription procedure. Also include a list of students rejected and the reasons for rejection.

E. List the total number of students by school, by sex, by race and by need that participate in middle school exploratory programs.

F. List the citywide male/female ratios of all vocational &c programs whose representation on the basis of sex is less than/35%. What provisions exist to alleviate the underrepresentation?

G. Please provide copies of all information about employability skills programs. List the schools that are provided this information and the method(s) utilized to disseminate it to schools.

Section II. District Core Programs

A. List the exploratory clusters, the schools in which these clusters are offered, and the enrollments by sex, need and grade levels.

B. List the employability skills clusters, the schools in which employability clusters are offered and the enrollments by sex, race, need and grade level.

Section III. Magnet Programs

A. List the magnet programs by type (in-school regular, in-school bilingual, out-of-school), the total enrollment by school, sex race and need that are currently operating.

B. List the total number of ORC Satellites, the total enrollment by program, location, sex, race and need.

C. List the ORC total enrollment by program, sex, race and need.

D. Describe the scheduling procedure (1/2 day morning/afternoon; week in/week out). List total enrollments per schedule (AM/PM) by program sex, race and need.

E. List the programs that have been transferred (from, to, and when).

F. List the programs that have been terminated (when).

G. List the cooperative programs that have been established by program, enrollments, location, sex race and need.

H. List the specific clusters being offered at the four high schools: Southwest I, East Boston Technical, Southwest II and Madison Park. Also list total enrollments by cluster/program, sex, race and need.

Section IV. In-School Bilingual

A. List the total number of limited-English proficient students enrolled in occupational education programs at the high and middle school levels by dominant language.

B. List the teacher/counselor/aide/student ratio for each program.

C. Please provide a description of the type of instructional materials and equipment being utilized.

D. Please list all administrative positions that have been created that deal with the provision of instruction and services for bilingual students.

E. Please provide a list of bilingual programs, their locations and enrollments by sex and dominant language.

Section V. Out-of-School Youth Ages 16-21

A. Please provide evidence that the Boston Prime Sponsor has coordinated all job training activities with the Boston Public Schools.

B. Please provide evidence that job training has been provided for bilingual and Chapter 766 students

C. Please provide a description of the recruitment and referral process of 16-21 participants for job training.

Section VI. Vocational/Occupational Education for Special Needs Students

A. Please list the schools in which substantially separate vocational programs are currently operating. Also, list total enrollments by school, program, sex and race. Please provide this information for both in-school and out-of-school special needs students.

B. Please provide a detail description of the system for the delivery of vocational education to special needs students.

C. Please provide evidence that staff development has been provided for staff to enable them to more effectively deal with special needs students.

D. Please provide evidence that the Occupational Skill Development Centers are operating. Also, list the programs, schools, total enrollments by sex and race.

E. Please provide evidence that the 502.4 prevocational and ninth grade diagnostic exploratory programs are currently operating. Also, list total enrollments by program, school, sex and race.

F. Please provide a list of career exploratory programs by school. Also, provide the total enrollments of special needs students by school, program, sex and race.

G. Please provide evidence that guidance services are being provided for special needs students.

H. Please provide evidence that comprehensive evaluation services are provided for special needs students.

Section VII. Program Changes and Deletions

A. List the programs transferred from the Boston Trade School to the ORC.

B. List the programs transferred from East Boston High to the ORC.

C. List the programs transferred from the pilot ORC and Dorchester High School to the ORC.

D. List the programs transferred from Jamaica Plain High to Southwest I High School.

Section VIII. Program Support Components

A. Please list all central office and district level management positions that deal with occupational education. Please provide descriptions of activities for which these positions are responsible.

B. Please provide a description of the managment process through which all appropriate groups in the public and private sectors are informed about available occupational opportunities.

C. Please provide evidence that all teachers have received staff development training on issues related to equal educational opportunity.

D. Please list the total number of bilingual teachers, counselors and aides by school. Also, provide evidence that these staff have received pre-service and inservice training.

E. Please provide evidence that advisory council members have received in-service training on occupational education.

F. Please provide a description of the curriculum development/revision process. List the programs that have undergone curriculum development.

G. Please provide evidence that the Advisory Council (ACCVOE) is in place and meet frequently.

H. List the total number (ACCVOE) members, their representatives, sex and race.

I. Provide evidence that a comprehensive job development and placement system is in place.

Exhibit B

DATA ANALYSIS

BOSTON UNIFIED PLAN FOR
OCCUPATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

PREPARED BY GREATER BOSTON REGIONAL EDUCATION CENTER
OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION TEAM

May 13, 1983

REVIEWER Sylvia Rosario **DATE** 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION **PP** 10 **SECTION** I - A - Compliance with Relevant State Laws

All vocational/occupational programs, including the HHORC and the individual Cooperative Industrial Programs, will reflect the racial ratios established by the Court for the citywide schools.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION Boston Public Schools Profile: Ed./Employment Courses

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE - **COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION:** FULL ___ PARTIAL ___ NON X

All vocational programs do not comply with the Chapter 622 Act of 1971 which prohibits discriminatory practices based on race, sex, religion and national origin. After considering the range of variation, as established by the Desegregation Plan, disproportionate enrollments are noted in programs at thirteen (13) high schools and sixteen (16 middle schools. Significantly outstanding disproportionality, based on race- that is, those that exceed the extent of permissable variation by more that 5% -are noted in programs at the 13 high schools and 9 of the above cited middle schools. Outstanding examples of these violations are the Jeremiah Burke High School where 100% of all students in the Business Law and Business Skills programs are black. At Hyde Park High School, white students are overrepresented in the Machine Cooperative program by 27%, and other minority students are entirely unrepresented in five (5) of the 9 business programs. White students at West Roxbury High School are overrepresented by 19% in the Drafting program. Black students are over-represented by more than 10% in Home Economics, Food Services programs at five (5) of the thirteen (13) high schools, including the HHORC and at three (3) of the middle schools. At East Boston High Schools where the total population for Black students is 25%, black students are overenrolled in Machine Shop by an oustanding high 61% · Other minorities are consistently unrepresented in vocational programs throughout the entire system.

RECOMMENDATION - Boston Public Schools must take immediate remedial action to correct racial imbalances.

REVIEWER Sylvia Rosario

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 9 SECTION I - B Compliance with Relevant State Laws

The Court mandates that provision for bilingual instruction must be made "in selected portions of the overall program". All services and necessary instructional orientation spelled out in the Bilingual Law fully pertain to Bilingual Vocational Training Programs. The defendant will select magnet centers for bilingual programs and All programs shall be eligible for such selection.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ___ PARTIAL ___ NON X

Refer to Section IV-A In School Bilingual, page 18

RECOMMENDATION

[illegible] ANALYSIS

REVIEWER Sylvia Rosario

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 9 SECTION I-C - Compliance with Relevant State Laws

Admissions Criteria a. In all instances students must elect to enroll in the program (i.e., no student shall be "assigned" to a specific program against his or her wishes, since these programs are not mandatory for any student or municipality under any State Law or pursuant regulations). This stipulation does not apply to Middle School and ninth grade exploratory programs which, in this context, are defined as part of the core curriculum for all students.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION - No documentation provided

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE

Unable to determine status of compliance

COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ____ PARTIAL ____ NON X

RECOMMENDATION - Boston Public Schools must provide data requested (a list of students that applied for vocational programs, the programs to which they applied and the programs to which they were assigned).

REVIEWER Sylvia Rosario **DATE** 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION **PP** 9 **SECTION** I-D - Compliance with Relevant State Laws

Admissions Criteria b. In cases where a program is oversubscribed, student selection will be based on random selection applied to the total number who have elected the program, providing that other requirements such as preserving required racial ratios and encouraging male - female balances are satisfied within the final student enrollment mix in a given program.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION - No documentation provided

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE **COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION:** **FULL** ___ **PARTIAL** ___ **NON** X

Unable to determine status of compliance

RECOMMENDATION - Boston Public Schools must provide requested data (the procedures utilized when a program is oversubscribed; a list of programs that are oversubscribed and the number of students by race, sex and need that are selected through the oversubscription procedure; and a list of students rejected and the reasons for rejection).

DATA ANALYSIS

REVIEWER Sylvia Rosario

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 9 SECTION I-E - Compliance with Relevant State Laws

Admissions Criteria c. Middle School students must participate in all exploratory cluster programs, thus exposing them to a broad range of occupations.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ____ PARTIAL ____ NON X

Refer to Section II-A Middle School Exploratory, page 8.

RECOMMENDATION

REVIEWER Sylvia Rosario

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 10 SECTION I-F Compliance with Relevant State Laws

Admissions Criteria e. In those programs in which students of one sex have represented less than 35% of the enrollment of that program, the admission to such programs shall specifically encourage a student composition for such programs in keeping with the citywide male/female student ratio.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION - Boston Public Schools Profile: Education/Employment Courses

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL___ PARTIAL___ NON X

Females are significantly underenrolled in non-traditional programs. Outstanding imbalances are noted at the HHORC in 14 skills training porgrams; females are entirely unrepresented in Welding Lab, Machine Drafting and Marine & Small Engine Repair. At Dorchester High School females are represented by only 8% in the Architectural Woodworking program. Underenrollments of females are noted in programs in 13 high schools, including the HHORC. Males are underenrolled in programs in 10 of those 13 high schools.

RECOMMENDATION - Boston Public Schools must take immediate remedial action to correct male/female imbalances in vocational/occupational programs in the 13 High Schools by developing strategies for active efforts to encourage a student composition that is reflective of the citywide male/female student ratio.

DATA ANALYSIS

REVIEWER Sylvia Rosario

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION **PP** 11 **SECTION** I-G - Compliance with Relevant State Laws

All eighth and ninth grade students in the system shall be provided with information about employability skills programs ......, career exploratory programs, guidance services; and, the Public Information System. Such information shall stress that all employability skills programs are open to all qualified students, without regard to race, sex, or other barries.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE **COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION:** **FULL** ____ **PARTIAL** X **NON** ____

Refer to Section II-A Middle School Career Education and High School Exploratory Programs, page 9; and Section VIII-B Public Information, page 33.

RECOMMENDATION

REVIEWER Therese Alston

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 12 SECTION II -A - Middle School Exploratory

Middle school exploratory clusters will be required for all students. There will be 3 groups of clusters:

1. Industry Related
2. Food-Home-Services-Health Related, and
3. Business-Distributive-Government Related. Every student will receive instruction in each of these three groups of clusters.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION - Boston Public Schools profile: ED/Employment Courses

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ___ PARTIAL X NON ___

Of the 26 operational middles schools, only 3 offer the Business-Distributive-Government Related Cluster: Phyllis Wheatley - Computer Literacy and Programming, James Timilty - Typing, and the William H Taft - Typing and Computer Programming. The Thomas Edison did offer Business Program in the past. However, this year a teacher was not hired and the Business Program in not operational.

The manner in which students are scheduled to participate in all three cluster areas is not consistent among middle schools. Some operate on a trimester schedule with students participating in all 3 cluster areas per year. Others vary to include 2 cluster areas per school year or in some cases 1 cluster per school year, depending on the type and number of offerings.

The middle schools which also do not offer Industry Related or The Food-Home-Services-Health Related Cluster areas follows:

a) Cheverus in District VIII does not offer the Food-Home-Services Health Related Clusters.
b) Donald McKay in District IX (6th grade only) does not offer Industry Related or Food-Home-Services-Health Related Clusters
c) Jackson-Mann in District IX does not offer the Food-Home-Services-Health Related Cluster.

RECOMMENDATION - All middle schools should make the inclusion of the Business-Distribution-Government Related Cluster a priority for the 83/84 school year, and particularly in those schools that have equipment on hand. There should also be some uniformity throughout the system in the manner in which the rotation of cluster offerings is implemented.

REVIEWER Therese Alston

DATE May 13, 1983

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 15A + B SECTION IIA-Middle School Career Education

Each middle school principal, together with the assistance of a Career Education Coordinator will be responsible for implementing a program of career exploratory and guidance experiences which will introduce all students in grades six, seven and eight to a broad range of career choices unlimited by stereotypes based upon race or sex. The Cleveland School would warrant a full-time position.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

Boston Public School Profile: ED/Employment Courses
82/83 list of Career Coordinators
Middle School Career Education Progress Report

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ___ PARTIAL X NON ___

All middle schools except the Solomon Lewenberg, Mario Umana, Jackson Mann and Donald McKay are listed as having a Career Education Coordinator who in all cases is either a teacher or guidance counselor with some career education responsibilities. Full-time career education coordinators do not exist in the middle schools with the exception of the Cleveland Middle School which has a full-time career education coordinator. The type of activities that these part-time coordinators implement are: guest speakers from various businesses via Project Business, infusion of career education curriculum into regular english, reading or social studies curriculum, field trips, computer assisted software, developmnet of career education modules to be implemented, and attendance at monthly guidance meetings at the HoRC conducted by the Senior Career Education Advisor for the purpose of instructing guidance staff in their responsibilities for providing career education, resource sharing, infusion methods, and consistency and collaboration among middle schools. A careful review of some of the materials that are currently being used by some of these career education coordinators indicates that unbiased resource material is available for use. This year's plan was to free up the coordinators from their regular teaching or guidance functions with the help of substitutes. In some schools, this has worked. In others it has not. Most of the actual career education implemented has taken place through its infusion into the regular classroom activities, guest speakers and field trips. The career coordinator at the Cleveland Middle School teaches a course on Career Education four periods per week to all 8th graders. He also coordinates all of the infusion activities and curriculum for the 6th and 7th graders.

-401-

RECOMMENDATION

The average amount of time that the identified career education coordinators spend on career education was about 10% - 15% for those interviewed during site visits (Timilty, Edison, Taft, Wheatley). It is recommended that the Boston Public Schools designate at least one full-time career education coordinator per district or increase the percentage of time to ½ or 1/3 time that the part-time inschool coordinators spend on career education activities. A fully implemented program of career education is still needed. It is also recommended that next school year, a sample of students be surveyed to determine the quality and degree of career education provided.

DATA ANALYSIS

REVIEWER Therese Alston

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 12 SECTION 11A - High School Exploratory

High school exploratory clsuters will be offered in grades 9-12 with only the 9th grade being mandatory for all students. Three major groups of clusters are: 1) Industry Related, 2) Food-Home-Services-Health Related, and 3) Business-Distribution-Government Related.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

- Boston Public Schools Profile: Education/Employment Courses
- 4/7/83 HORC Enrollment Chart III

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE

COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ___ PARTIAL X NON ___

The following high schools do not offer mandatory 9th grade exploratory programs in all three cluster areas:

a) Jeremiah E. Burke does not offer Industry Related Cluster
b) Copley High does not offer Industry Related Cluster and Food-Home-Health-Services Related Cluster
c) Tileston does not offer Food-Home-Health-Services Related Cluster and Business-Distribution-Government Related Cluster
d) Boston High offers the Business - Distribution-Government Related Cluster only
e) English High does not offer Industry Related Cluster
*f) Brighton High does not offer Industry Related Cluster
g) Mario Umana and Boston Technical (exam school) do not offer the Business-Distribution-Government Related Cluster and Food-Home-Health-Services Related Cluster. Umana listed only one Food Services student.
*h) Hyde Park High does not offer the Industry Related Cluster
i) Dorchester High has no 9th grade exploratory students in the Industry Related (woodworking) only 10-12th students
*j) East Boston High does not offer the Industry Related Cluster
k) McKinley High School (special needs only) does not offer any specific exploratory clusters - only skill training clusters

The Industry Related and Food-Home-Services-Health Related Clusters were also offered as exploratory for grade 10-12. However, data did not distinguish regular students from exploratory in the Business Cluster for grades 10-12. The following schools offer exploratory in all 3 Clusters: Jamaica Plain High, West Roxbury High, South Boston High, Charlestown High and Madison Park High.

* These 3 schools do not offer exploratory Industrial Arts. The 9th grade students enrolled are in regular skills training programs, i.e. automotive and machine technology cooperative programs.

RECOMMENDATION

- Attention needs to be given to the ever increasing staff layoffs and program discontinuance in the Industry Related Clusters.

REVIEWER Therese Alston

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 12 SECTION II-B - Core Programs (High School Employability Skill Areas)

All High Schools will offer Employability Skills for general students in 3 areas:

1) Business-Office Education
2) Food-Home-Health Services
3) Distributive-Marketing

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION - Boston Public Schools Profile: Education/Employment Courses

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE

COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ___ PARTIAL X NON ___

None of the High Schools offer the Food-Home-Health Service Cluster as an employability skill area. Home Economics is offered,but it is exploratory. The ORC is the only facility offering the Food-Home-Health Service Cluster as an employability skill area. All of the high schools offer the Business-Office Education Cluster.

The additional non-compliance exists:

a) West Roxbury's Distributive-Marketing closed
b) Hyde Park does not offer the Distributive-Marketing cluster
c) South Boston High does not offer the Distributive-Marketing cluster
d) East Boston High does not offer the Distributive-Marketing cluster
e) Copley High does not offer Food-Home-Health Service nor the Distributive-Marketing cluster
f) Boston High does not offer the Food-Home-Health Service cluster nor the Distributive-Marketing cluster

*Umana High, a specialized school, and Boston Technical High, an examination school, are exempt from this provision.

RECOMMENDATION

DATA ANALYSIS

REVIEWER Therese Alston

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 18 SECTION III-A & B- Magnet Programs

Magnet Vocational/Occupational Education Programs in Boston will include the following:
a central occupational resource center

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION - Students Assignment information booklet (83-84)
Boston Public Schools Profile: Education/Employment Courses

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL X PARTIAL___ NON___

The Central Occupational Resource Center is operational.

-404-

RECOMMENDATION

REVIEWER Therese Alston

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 18 - 19 SECTION III-A-G - Magnet Programs: Satellite Programs

Magnet Vocational/Occupational Education Programs in Boston will include the following:

ORC Satellites - 7 Coop programs and Agricultural program at Jamaica Plain High

District 1-8 will each contain at least one Cooperative Type program in single occupational clusters.

Current enrollments at the ORC Satellites should be at about the 1,500 slot level.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

- Memorandum dated 4/5/83 regarding Unified Plan for Vocational Education

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE

COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ___ PARTIAL X NON ___

Existing Cooperative Programs are:

District	School	Program	# of Students
I	Brighton High	Automotive	223
III	West Roxbury High	Agri-Business	117
IV	Hyde Park High	Machine Shop	93
V	Dorchester High	Architecural/Woodworking & Upholstery	84
VIII	East Boston High	Machine Shop	132
	(649 - non-compliance)	Total enrollment	649
	1,500		

* The Cooperative program in District VI - South Boston High (autobody) and District VII - Charlestown High (electrical) were closed and transferred to the HHORC on September 1, 1981.

Jamaica Plain High (District II) has no listed Cooperative Programs.

Current enrollments at the ORC Satellites total 649.

RECOMMENDATION

DATA ANALYSIS

REVIEWER Therese Alston

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 18-23 SECTION III-A-H - High School Magnet Programs

Magnet Vocational/Occupational Education Programs in Boston will include the following:

Magnet programs in 4 new High Schools

1) SWI - Agribusiness and Environment Control/Natural Resources - 2) East Boston Technical-Transportation & Marine
3) SWII - Information Management System - 4) Madison Park - Fine Arts & Humanities and Communication/Media Program

---

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION - Boston Public Schools profile: Education/Employment Courses

---

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ____ PARTIAL X NON ____

1) Southwest I - West Roxbury High has an agribusiness program that includes enrivonmental control/natural resources Enrollment in the Agribusiness totals 117
2) East Boston Technical- (No such school exists). However, Mario Umana has an Aviation (Transportation) Program with enrollment at 427. The Umana does not offer Marine Science
3) Southwest II - Jamaica Plain High - no magnet programs exist at Jamaica Plain High
4) Madison Park - Communications media program is offered and enrollment is currently 108. The Arts & Humanities (music) that Madison Park offers is not a vocational program.

RECOMMENDATION - Jamaica Plain High needs to implement a Magnet Information Mangement System Program.

DATA ANALYSIS

REVIEWER Therese Alston

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 21 SECTION III-C - Magnet Program: ORC Enrollment

The ORC is currently designed for at least 3600 half-time slots.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

Chart III. - Boston Public Schools profile and April 7, 1983 HHORC Enrollment

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE

COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ___ PARTIAL ___ NON X

The current exploratory enrollment at the HORC is 728.
The current skill training enrollment at the HORC is 1861.
Overall HORC enrollment totals 2589.
Enrollment is at 71% of capacity.

RECOMMENDATION

- The ORC should make strong efforts to increase enrollments and retain interested students in order to reach and maintain full capacity.

REVIEWER Therese Alston

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 12 A SECTION III-C - Magnet Programs: ORC Federal Clusters

Program offering at the ORC will include all major occupational clusters as identified by the U.S. Department of HEW. Course content in the field of trade and industry will be emphasized.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION - Chart of current program enrollment at the HORC - March 29, 1983

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ____ PARTIAL X NON ____

There are 5 federal clusters for which there are no program offerings: Agriculture, Natural resources and Environment, Fine Arts and Humanities, Transportation and Public Service.

Of the total 35 programs offerings, 14 are in the Construction cluster. This emphasis is on the trade and industry area.

* 1) Agriculture no program offering - non compliance

* 2) Natural resources & Environment - no program offerings - non-compliance

3) Construction - Cabinet Making, Carpentry, Plumbing, Building Maintenance and Repair, Heating and Air Conditioning-refrigeration,

4) Manufacturing - Electrical Technology, Electronics Technology, Machine Lab, Sheet Metal Lab, Welding, Machine Drafting

* 5) Transportation - No program offerings - non compliance

6) Communications & Media - Photographic Technology, Television Production, Printing, Commercial Design.

7) Product Services (Mechanic Repairs) - Autobody Repair Lab, Automotive/Truck Repair, Marine & Small Engine Repair

8) Marketing & Distribution - Retailing-Marketing-Management

9) Business and Office Data Processing - Advanced Office & Management, Legal Office, Medical Office Assistance, Word Processing, Banking.

10) Personal Services - Cosmetology

11) Hospitality and Recreation - Hotel Hospitality

12) Home Economics - Food Services, Child Care, Fashion Illustration, Fashion Interior Design

13) Health - Health Aide, Health lab skills, medical office assistance and nursing assistance

* 14) Fine Arts & Humanities - No program offerings- non compliance

* 15) Public Service - No program offerings - non compliance

RECOMMENDATION

REVIEWER Therese Alston

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 47 SECTION III-E-F - Magnet Programs: Program Changes/Deletions Transfers

1) Upon completion of the new ORC - the vocational program at Boston Trade School will be phased into this new facility
2) The machinist program being offered at East Boston High School will be housed at the new ORC.
3) Upon completion of the new ORC, the Pilot ORC will be phased into the new facility.
4) Dorchester High Upholstery/Furniture Finishing/Cabinet Making Programs will be housed at the new ORC.
5) Jamaica Plain High Horticulture/Animal Husbandry Program phased out and expanded into an Agri-Business/Natural Resources program at SWI- West Roxbury High

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

re: Unified Plan for Vocational Education - Memorandum dated April 5, 1983

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE

COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ___ PARTIAL X NON ___

1) The Boston Trade Vocational programs transferred to HHORC on September 1, 1980 were:
   - Automotive
   - Electronics
   - Cabinet Making
   - Carpentry
   - Drafting
   - Electrical
   - Machine Shop
   - Painting
   - Plumbing
   - Printing
   - Sheet Metal
   - Welding
2) East Boston machine shop has not been transferred
3) Pilot ORC transferred to new ORC on September 1, 1980.
4) No programs transferred to new ORC from Dorchester High,
5) Jamaica Plain High- Agri-Business/Natural Resources transferred to West Roxbury High, SWI.

RECOMMENDATION

REVIEWER Mimi Jones

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 25 SECTION IV-A - In-School Bilingual

According to current statistics (1975), the Boston Public Schools must have the capacity to serve:

- -1140 high school level limited English proficient students (650 Spanish; 490 Other)
- -1180 limited English proficient students at the middle school level (840 Spanish; 340 Other)

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

- Provisions for Bilingual Instruction in vocational/occupational education programs
- Matrix of Bilingual porgrams citywide, by skill area, location, gender designation, and dominant language

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE

COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ___ PARTIAL X NON ___

All limited English proficient students are mainstreamed into regular vocational/occupational education programs. A total of 2,695 limited English proficient students (1535 at the high school level and 1160 at the middle school level). are enrolled in various vocational/occupational programs. A total of 785 Spanish Speaking students are enrolled in vocational/occupational programs at the high school level and 740 students at the middle school level. The number of Spanish Speaking students enrolled in vocational/occupational education programs at the high school level exceeds the projected enrollment. At the middle school level, the enrollment of Spanish Speaking students in vocational/occupational education programs is slightly below the projected level.

RECOMMENDATION

- Since the Unified Plan specifications are based of 1975 statistics, the service plan should be revised to reflect current demographic data on the limited English proficient student population.

REVIEWER Mimi Jones

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 26 SECTION IV-B - In-School Bilingual

Targeted maximum counselor/teacher ratios are:
Counselor: 1:75
Instructor: 1 to 15 (no aide)
1 to 20 (wite aide)
Priority should be placed on Spanish Speaking

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION - Roster of Bilingual Support Services Teacher/Counselor/Student Ratios

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ____ PARTIAL ____ NON ____

Since all limited English proficient students are mainstreamed into regular vocational/occupational programs, bilingual teacher/student and counselor/student ratios represent the number of teachers and counselors in relationship to the Number. . Bilingual counselors and teachers are not assigned to students based upon language. The ratios are representative of the total number of bilingual teachers and counselors in relationship to the number of limited English proficient students mainstreamed into regular vocational/occupational programs. The teacher/student ratios are in compliance with the stated provision with the exception of the following schools and programs.

- Umana High 1:24 (no aide)
- HHORC - Auto/Truck Repair 1:35

HHORC	Auto/Truck Repair	1:35
	Printing	1:16
	Cosmetology	1:17
	Food Service	1:18

It should be noted that six (6) Bilingual paraprofessional aides are deployed throughout the Clusters at the HHORC to provide instructional support services.
Given the 1:75 ratio specified, the ORC has 1 bilingual counselor in relationship to a total of 474 limited English proficient students enrolled in various programs.

RECOMMENDATION

REVIEWER Mimi Jones

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 26 SECTION IV-C In-School Bilingual

All Bilingual Occupational Programs will be fully equipped with appropriate multi-media instructional aids.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION - List of materials used by Bilingual Support Services.

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ___ PARTIAL x NON ___

Extensive resources for instructional support, including printed texts and audio visual aids have been developed for use with limited English proficient students. These materials are designed for use with the multi-linguistic limited English proficient student population. Many materials are available in the native languages such as Spanish, Chinese, and Khmer. A significant portion of the materials is oriented towards the improvement and mastery of vocabulary used in particular skill training programs and trade areas. These materials are disseminated and made available to all programs by the Bilingual vocational staff, including the Coordinator, Bilingual Aides, Bilingual Materials Development Specialist and the Vocational English as a second language instructor. Materials are available to district vocational/occupational programs upon request.

RECOMMENDATION - Outreach to district vocational/occupational programs should be strengthened. All efforts should be coordinated with the Bilingual Department of Boston Public Schools.

DATA ANALYSIS

REVIEWER Mimi Jones

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 26 SECTION IV-D - Bilingual In-Schools

A director of curriculum for occupational programs will be budgeted as well as an Assistant Director of Bilingual/Occupational Education and an Assistant Director of Special Education within the central occupational education staff of the Boston Public Schools. The Director and Assistant Director will be directly responsible to the Associate Superintendent for Career and Occupational Education.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION - No documentation provided

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ___ PARTIAL ___ NON x

Under the current central management structure for vocational occupational education for Boston Public Schools, the positions of Director of Curriculum for occupational programs, Assistant Director of Bilingual/Occupational Education, Assistant Director of Special Needs Occupational Education, and Associate Superintendent for Career and Occupational Education do not exist. However, a Manager for Instructional Design, Coordinator of Bilingual Vocational Education, Coordinator of Special Needs Vocational Education, and Director of the HHORC/Education and Employment exist to function in these respective capacities.

RECOMMENDATION - Boston Public Schools must submit requested data (A list of all central office and district level management positions that deal with occupational education and a description of activities for which these positions are responsible).

DATA ANALYSIS

REVIEWER Mimi Jones

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 29-30 SECTION IV-E - In-School Bilingual

Bilingual Vocational Programs should be offered at the following middle schools: M. Curley, Edison, Timilty and McCormack. Bilingual Vocational Programs should be offered at the following high schools: Roxbury, English, Trade and ORC.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

- Matrix of Bilingual Programs citywide, by skill area, location, gender designation, and dominant language.

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ____ PARTIAL ____ NON X

Bilingual Vocational Programs are not currently offered in Boston Public Schools. All limited English proficient students are mainstreamed into regular vocational/occupational education programs.

RECOMMENDATION

REVIEWER Mimi Jones

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 36 SECTION VI-A Vocational Occupational Education for Special Needs Students

Substantially separate demonstration projects will serve students with moderate to special needs at Hyde Park High, Dorchester High, McKinley Pre-Vocational School, Boston Trade School and Roxbury High School. Demonstration projects will be expanded to serve additional students.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

-Boston Public Schools Profile/Education and Employment Courses (Substantially Separate programs)

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL X PARTIAL ___ NON ___

Significant achievements have been made in providing pre-vocational and vocational skills training to substantially separate prototype Special Needs Students. Program development has exceeded projected efforts.

Substantially separate pre-vocational and vocational skills training programs are currently operating at the Proposed sites with the exception of Boston Trade and Roxbury High which are closed facilities. Substantially separate program offerings have been expanded significantly to include additional sites at the Jeremiah E. Burke and English High Schools, the Tileston School, the Horace Mann School for the Deaf and the Humphrey Occupational Resource Center.

RECOMMENDATION

REVIEWER Mimi Jones

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 37 SECTION VI-B - Vocational/Occupational Education for Special Needs Students

Planning efforts for students identified through the core evaluation process will be directed toward the development of a comprehensive system for the delivery of vocational education for Special Needs Students that includes Assessment Procedures Curriculum Modification, Environment Access, In-Service Education, and an aggressive Placement and Follow-up program.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

- Written Policy and procedures for Special Needs Students to Receive Vocational Education
- Commonwealth In-Service Institute Grant Application, approved 2/15/83 ("Training in Curriculum Adaptation")
- HHORC Daily Bulletin announcing Inservice Workshop regarding strategies for modifying curriculum for Special Needs Students

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE

COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL X PARTIAL ____ NON ____

Provisions and procedures for the delivery of vocational/occupational education services to Special Needs students include the major elements delineated by the Plan. Formal vocational assessment procedures and instruments are available at the HHORC through the Special Needs Assessment and Vocational Assessment Programs. Curriculum modification and adaptation strategies are implemented through workshop presentations and the ongoing vocational curriculum imporvement and revision process. Job Placement and follow-up services are also provided.

RECOMMENDATION

DATA ANALYSIS

REVIEWER Mimi Jones

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 39 SECTION VI-C - Vocational/Occupational Education for Special Needs Students In-Service Education

In-service program will be developed for providing staff development training in understanding and dealing with special needs.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

- -Action Plan for Special Education
- -Commonwealth In-service Institute Grant Application approved 2/15/83 for workshops in "Training in curriculum adaptation"
- -Commonwealth Inservice Institute Grant Workshop
- -HHORC Daily Bulletin
- -Massachusetts Vocational Curriculum Resource Center Workshop announcement

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE

COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ____ PARTIAL X NON ____

Inservice education has been implemented through a series of staff development activities. Among these have been training workshops conducted by the Massachusetts Vocational Curriculum Resource Center, Commonwealth Inservice Institute Grant Workshops, and coordination efforts of the vocational and special education staff. There is no evidence that these or comparable inservice training activities have been also provided to vocational/occupational education instructors citywide.

RECOMMENDATION - Inservice training should be expanded to include all instructors of special needs students in vocational/occupational programs citywide.

DATA ANALYSIS

REVIEWER Mamie Jones

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 39B-C SECTION VI-D Vocational Occupational Education for Special Needs Students

Occupational Skill Development Centers located at Dorchester High and Hyde Park High Schools will be comprised of three (3) occupational skill areas: 1) Food Service, 2) Business and Office, and 3) Building Services

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

Boston Public Schools Profile: Education/Employment Courses

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ☐ PARTIAL ☒ NON ☐

Occupational Skills Development Centers are currently operating at Dorchester and Hyde Park High Schools as specified by the Plan. An additional center operates at Charlestown High. Each center offers training in all three occupational skill areas with the exception of Dorchester High which does not offer business and office.

RECOMMENDATION

The Occupational Skill Development Center at Dorchester High should institute a Business and Office program.

REVIEWER Mimi Jones

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 38 SECTION VI-E Vocational/Occupational Education for Special Needs Students

The following schools are recommended for installation of occupational skills training and exploratory programs in 1977-78. This would include five (5) high schools and four (4) middle schools.

High Schools:
- (1) Boston Trade-Hearing Impaired and Mildly Handicapped.
- (2) Dorechester High-Mildly Handicapped
- (3) Brighton High - Mildly Handicapped (4th & 5th schools to be determined)

Middle schools:
- (1) Gavin-Mildly Handicapped
- (2) Wilson - Mildly Handicapped (3rd & 4th schools to be determined)

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

Boston Public Schools Profile: Education/Employment Courses

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL X PARTIAL___ NON___

Significant achievements have been made in providing skills training and exploratory programs to Special Needs Students who have a variety of impairments. The level of program development has extended beyond projected activities.

Occupational skills training and exploratory programs exist at six (6) high schools in addition to the HHORC to serve the designated populations. Pre-vocational and exploratory occupational programs operate at seven (7) middle schools to serve the populations designated by the Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

REVIEWER Mimi Jones

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION **PP** 39C-D **SECTION** VI-F Vocational/Occupational Education for Special Needs Students

Located in a separate facility (to be determined), a substantially separate (502.4) career exploratory day school program will operate to serve 30-40 students between the ages of 12 and 16.

Ninth grade diagnostic exploratory programs will develop three (3) substantially separate 9th grade prevocational labs at:
(1) Boston Trade
(2) Roxbury High (3) to be determined.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

Boston Public Schools Profile:Education/Employment Courses

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE **COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION:** FULL X PARTIAL___ NON___

Significant progress has been made in providing career exploratory program offerings to Special Needs Students. Program development has extended beyond the planned level of services.

The designated sites for the location of the ninth grade diagnostic exploratory programs have since been closed as school facilities. The specified programs are currently operating at the HHORC, the Harvard-Kent school, the Horace Mann and the McKinley schools. The McKinley school, a separate facility for substantially separate students, primarily serves 41 students.

RECOMMENDATION

DATA ANALYSIS

REVIEWER Mimi Jones

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 39-E-F SECTION VI-G Vocational/Occupational Education for Special Needs Students (Occupational Guidance Counseling)

Seven counselors will assist and prepare Special Needs students to access appropriate mainstream skill training programs. They will:

- advise Core Evaluation Team in the development of Vocational Component of educational plans
- assist shop teachers and resource teachers to design and implement adapted occupational education programs and inform parents in the career education process as it relates to their children
- one counselor will be assigned to serve the low-incidence population of special needs students with visual or physical handicaps.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

- Abstract of Program for Career Instruction Managers
- Roster of 1982 Career Instruction managers

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL X PARTIAL___ NON___

Nine Career Instruction Managers are funded through P.L. 94-142 to provide vocational counseling services to Special Needs Students in grades 9 thru 12. They are responsible to assist and counsel Special Needs Students in making appropriate occupational choices and to provide support services needed to place and maintain students in their occupational programs. They act as liasions between shop teachers and the resource and academic teachers of the sending schools. They also provide appropriate communication and information to parents of Special Needs Students. Career Instruction Managers are assigned to High Schools and the HHORC.

A liaison who has appropriate sign language skills is available at the HHORC.

RECOMMENDATION

REVIEWER Mimi Jones

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION **PP** 39-F **SECTION** VI-H Vocational/Occupational Education for Special Needs Students

Before students with special needs can be placed in an appropriate skill development program, they must receive a comprehensive social/vocational assessment. The Core Evaluation process mandates this as a part of the total evaluation for secondary school students.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

- Special needs response to State Department of Education's monitoring of the Unified Plan as it applies to Vocational/Occupational Education
- Vocational Assessment Program description.
- Special Needs Assessment Program Description

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE **COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION:** FULL * PARTIAL___ NON___

The Individual Education Plan developed through the Core Evaluation process includes provisions for vocational training when designated. Formal vocational assessment procedures and instruments are available at the HHORC. These include the Special Needs Assessment Program and the Vocational Assessment Program.

Through the Special Needs Assessment Program at the Humphrey Center, students are accepted to exploratory programs for approximately six (6) weeks and offered training in nine (9) occupational program areas. After the student completes the exploratory program, he/she is then mainstreamed into the selected regular skills training program.

The Vocational Assessment Project provides a battery of work samples to assess special needs students. These include the Valpar series and the Jewish Vocational Evaluation Services.

RECOMMENDATION

DATA ANALYSIS

REVIEWER Mimi Jones

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 47 SECTION VII-A-D - Program Changes and Deletions

A. Vocational programs at Boston Trade School will be phased into the new ORC
B. Machinist program being offered at East Boston High School will be housed at the new ORC
C. The pilot ORC will be phased into the new ORC facility
D. The Upholstery/Furniture Finishing/Cabinet Making at Dorchester High will be transferred to the new ORC
E. Horticultural/Animal Husbandry program at Jamaica Plain High will be phased out and into an expanded Agri-Business and Natural Resource program to be offered at Southwest I High School (West Roxbury High)

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION April 5th memorandum regarding Unified Plan for Vocational/Occupational Programs

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ___ PARTIAL X NON ___

All proposed program transfers have been completed as specified by the plan with the exception of the following:
- The machinist program at East Boston High has not been transferred to the HHORC.
- The Upholstery/Furniture Finishing/Cabinet Making programs at Dorchester High School have not been transferred to the HHORC

RECOMMENDATION - Boston Public Schools must take appropriate action to complete all program transfers.

DATA ANALYSIS

REVIEWER Hsiauon Chu

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 48-53 **SECTION** VIII - A program Support Components (Management Modifications)

A first priority need is for a management structure which, by nature and intent, can account for an articulated, quality vocational/occupational delivery capability, systemwide. The structure should include central management functions (Associate Superintendent for Vocational/Occupational Education) and district management functions (Community District Superintendent).

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION - No documentation provided

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ____ PARTIAL ____ NON x

The position of Associate Superintendent for Vocational/Occupational Education does not currently exist. However, the position of Director of HHORC/Education and Employment is responsible for administering all vocational/occupational education programs.

Systematic management is not clearly demonstrated in the following areas:

Central Management Functions

1. evaluation of outreach efforts
2. evaluation of all vocational/occupational education programs
3. direct information/reporting channels and mechnisms with court appointed advisory groups
4. management information system for vocational/occupational education
5. fiscal control, responsibility and accountability for all units and programs.
6. annual systemwide program accountability report

District Management Functions

Community district superintendents' roles and responsibilities in the area of vocational/occupational education are not clearly delineated.

RECOMMENDATION - Boston Public Schools must institute a distinctive management structure which accounts for an effective vocational/occupational education delivery system.

DATA ANALYSIS

REVIEWER Mimi Jones

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 53-56 SECTION VIII-B - Program Support Components (Public Information)

Public Information System campaign be instituted. Components to include:

1. Information lines-24 hour information lines placed in community based resource centers; information packets to be mailed and hand distributed.
2. Television -30 & 60 second spots
3. Newspapers
4. Matchbox advertising
5. Transit advertising

The impact focus - 1. Students - 2. Others having direct influence upon prospective students - 3. Government, Media, etc. The entire population should be impacted upon and all components be used, and used systematically.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

1. Recruitment Article entitled "Boston Schools Recruit Students" - March 23, 1983 issued of the West Roxbury Transcript
2. The March 1983 edition of the Humphrey Center Newsletter

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/EMPLEMENTATION: FULL ___ PARTIAL X NON ___

Current public information efforts do not include all components specified by the Plan. The public information efforts are coordinated on a part time basis by the Assistant to the Director of the HHORC/Education and Employment. The major activities have included an Open House of the HHORC, slidetape productions and presentations to potential students, and the development and dissemination of the March, 1983 Humphrey Center Newsletter to school personnel, community organizations and others having direct or indirect influence upon students and prospective enrollees. These documents are distributed by hand delivery and direct mailings. These efforts have been focused upon providing information regarding the HHORC to acquaint appropriate groups with opportunities which are available at the Center. Some public relations efforts regarding the Humphrey Center have been accomplished thorugh the Advisory Committees, periodic Electronic Media coverage, and through Loaned Business Executives who market the Center to Industry and community groups.

RECOMMENDATION - The implementation of a systematic, aggressive, and pervasive public information campaign is vital to the vocational/occupational education system in Boston. It should be geared to making the greatest impact on the appropriate target groups. This can better be achieved by appointing a full time experienced public information officer to coordinate, carry out this function and objectives.

DATA ANALYSIS

REVIEWER Sylvia Rosario

DATE 5/1-/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 61 SECTION VIII-C Program Support Component (EEO In-Service Training)

An institution will be identified which will provide equal educational opportunity training for all teachers in vocational/occupational education programs.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION - A list of in-service workshops conducted at the HHORC during the 1982-83 school year

school year.

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ___ PARTIAL X NON ___

Three (3) in-service workshops related to equal educational opportunity have been conducted at the HHORC during the 1982-83 school year. Topics have included Sexual Harassment, Caribbean Culture Awareness and School Climate Improvement. There is no evidence that all vocational/occupational education teachers systemwide participated in these training sessions.

RECOMMENDATION - Training provisions should be extended to include all vocational/occupational instructors throughout the system.

DATA ANALYSIS

REVIEWER Mimi Jones

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 62 SECTION VIII-D - Program Support Component (Bilingual In-services Training)

Bilingual instructors will be part of all inservice programs

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

- A list of in-service workshops conducted at the HHORC during the 1982-83 school year.

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ____ PARTIAL x NON ____

In-service workshops conducted at the HHORC are available to all instructors, including Bilingual instructors. There is no evidence that systemwide Bilingual vocational/occupational instructors have participated in those sessions.

RECOMMENDATION

- Training provisions should be extended to include all Bilingual vocational/occupational instructors throughout the system.

DATA ANALYSIS

REVIEWER Mimi Jones

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 67-72 SECTION VIII E,G,&H Program Support Component

The ACCVOE (Advisory Council for Career/Vocational/Occupational Education) will meet at least once per month during the school year. The composition of the council shall be:

15 persons (1/3 Black) Representatives of:

- a) Bilingual Community
- b) Business and Industry
- c) City Government
- d) Labor
- e) Minority Representation
- f) Parent (thru CPAC)
- g) Special Education
- h) Student

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

-Minutes of ACCVOE meetings held November 30, 1983, January 11, 1983, February 15, 1983, and March 8, 1983.
-Blank D-1, November, 1982 (Advisory Committee Roster)
-Boston Public Schools Local Plan for Occupational Education Programs

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ___ PARTIAL X NON ___

These data indicate that the ACCVOE has met on a consistent basis during the current school year. The council consists of 14 members, representing target groups specified by the plan with the exception of Special Education, parent (thru Citywide Parent Advisory Counsil), and a student representative.

The council does not consist of 1/3 (5) Black membership.

-426-

RECOMMENDATION

Increase the current Black representation by three to comply with the specified percentage. The membership should also be modified to include a parent, student and Special Education representative.

DATA ANALYSIS

REVIEWER Maisuon Chu

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 64-67 SECTION VIII-F - Program Support Components (Curriculum Acquisition/Revision)

Curriculum design is an integral component of this plan. Since it is not feasible to perform full-scale curriculum development during the early months of this plan, several other efforts, currently in place, will be utilized. These efforts include E/D Model, Project CAREER, CEDIS, ACE, Mobile Career Laboratory.

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

- 1982-83 Curriculum Process and Procedures Package

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ____ PARTIAL x NON ____

The Department of Education sponsored curriculum development efforts stipulated in the Unified Plan have been discontinued. Documentation presents no evidence that Boston has utilized these curriculum materials. The Division of Occupational Education currently funds a statewide vocational curriculum resource center located at Minuteman Regional Vocational Technical School, Lexington. The center is utilized by Boston Public Schools. Significant progress has been made in the area of curriculum improvement. Boston Public Schools has engaged in a series of vocational curriculum improvement activities. Currently, efforts are directed toward the development of a full-scale Personalized Competency-Based Vocational Curriculum for all programs at the HHORC and selected programs at other schools. Ninety percent completion of these curricula is targeted for the end of June, 1984. An Occupational Instructional Design Group that includes a manager and three (3) curriculum specialists is responsible for coordinating these efforts. The Department of Education provides funding through Chapter 636 for five (5) additional curriculum specialists to assist in this process.

RECOMMENDATION

- Curriculum efforts should be expanded to include all vocational/occupational programs.

DATA ANALYSIS

REVIEWER Therese Alston

DATE 5/13/83

UNIFIED PLAN SPECIFICATION PP 69-70 SECTION VIII-I Comprehensive Job Development and Placement

The school system will develop the capacity to: a) design employability plans, b) establish counseling teams, c) plan job development, d) accomplish job placement and e) keep a statistical follow-up (minimum 3 years)

SUPPORTIVE DOCUMENTATION

- 3/22/83 Action Plan Report on Job Development and Placement - HORC
- 4/4/83 Memo and Attachments Re: Program Support Components

STATUS OF COMPLIANCE COMPLIANCE/IMPLEMENTATION: FULL ___ PARTIAL X NON ___

A uniform system citywide for job development and placement has not been fully instituted for vocational/occupational education. A comprehensive system is in place for students who attend the HORC. Job developers are assigned to each cluster as well as to the Satellite Cooperative Programs. However, there needs to be centralized coordination through which citywide uniformity in the areas of policy, procedures and administrative responsibilities can be established.

RECOMMENDATION

- One person should be appointed specifically to act as the coordinator for job development and placement citywide to coordinate the Completer-Leaver follow up reporting system, establish the policies and procedures by which all students are placed, and to maintain accountability for all programs citywide.

Greater Boston Regional Education Center
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

27 Cedar Street, Wellesley, Massachusetts 02181 431-7825

June 7, 1983

MEMORANDUM

TO: Naisuon Chu

FROM: Sylvia Rosario S.R.

RE: Clarification of Issues around HHORC
Enrollments - Boston Monitoring Report

In reference to the memorandum from Charles Glenn to Dr. Cronin, dated May 24, 1983, and regarding the Monitoring Report for Boston please be advised that program enrollment data for the HHORC were anlyzed based on information provided from two sources: 1) the Boston Public Schools Profile and 2) data provided in the April 11, 1983, letter from John Coakley (as you are aware, this letter had not been presented to me until May 6, 1983, a few days prior to the report deadline date of May 11, 1983, and after the program analyses had been completed).

Enrollment Analyses

Attached is a detailed account of program enrollment percentages, by race and sex, for all programs at each of the middle and high schools, including the HHORC. Only those programs with disproportionate enrollments are listed on these work sheets. The bases for determining disproportionality were the court-approved percentage goals established for each district as they appear on the computer print-out for March 1983.

Since the percentage goals for the HHORC, indicated in the April 11th Coakley letter were slightly different than those on the March, 1983 computer print-out, enrollment data were again anlyzed and as we have discussed earlier, you will find two sets of detailed analyses for programs at the HHORC in the attached worksheets--one set using percentage goals as they appear on the print-out and another set using percentage goals as indicated in the Coakley letter.

Permissable Variation

You will note that on page 9 of the Unified Plan, under the section entitled "Enrollment Balances", the following: "Programs will attempt to achieve appropriate male-female ratios as well as racial ratios". The word "appropriate" is clarified and defined in the very next sentence which reads, "Under the terms of the Court order, all programs including the individual Cooperative Industrial Programs will conform to racial ratios established for the district."

Logically, in order to determine the Court-ordered racial ratios established for the districts, the Student Desegregation Plan was consulted. Beginning on page 72, last paragraph, and continuing on page 73 is this statement:

> "Where necessary in order to fit students assigned by geocode units to seat capacities, to make allowances for geographical obstacles and transportation routes and to minimize mandatory busing, the composition of schools within a district may vary within ranges to be determined by computing the white, black and other minority shares of the District's student population and multipying the resultant percentages by 25 percent. For example, white students residing in Brighton-Mission Hill Distric I make up 44 percent of the District's school population. Under this guideline the extent of *permissible variation thus is 11 percentage points. While the desired norm shall be 44 percent, the percent white students in District I community schools may, where necessary, range between 33 and 55 percent..........."

While the method for determining district percentages is defined in the Student Desegregation Plan and the subsequent modification memoranda and orders, the bases for determining racial ratios is the March, 1983, computer print-out which identifies established percentage goals for each district as: "High Percent, Ideal Percent, Low Percent". It was found that the ranges between the high and low percentages and the deviation from the ideal percentage (or the norm) appeared to adhere to the formula, herein described, taking into account, changes over time in the total student population.

Prescribed Specific Criteria

Page 9 of the Unified Plan does prescribe specific criteria for the admission of students in programs; however, our ability to fully evaluate the admissions process was limited due to the non-submission of pertinent documents that Boston was requested to provide us. Reference to these missing documents is made in the appended Data Analyses Section of our report and a separate page is given to each criterion to have been evaluated. Please refer to pages 3 and 4 of the review sheets. Other criteria which were evaluated, with reference to the admissions process, will be found on pages 8, 18, 9 and 33 of the review sheets as indicated on pages 2, 5 and 7, respectively.

My memorandum to Naisuon Chu, dated May 19, 1983, which is also appended to our report, explains the question raised about the 5% deviation. Please refer to paragraph three of the memorandum, entitled "Enrollments based on Race". Given the degree of allowable variance which factors in dependent variables such as changes over time, (demographic changes, program changes, etc.) to exceed the range of permissible variation by even one percentage point is significant. To exceed the range by 5% certainly deserves special attention. Therefore, 5% beyond the range of "permissible variation" represents outstanding disproportionality.

I am attaching the worksheets (which includes two sets for the HHORC) which I believe will answer some of the questions raised; copies of excerpted pages from

---

*Here is where we find the reference to, and the explanation of the term "permissible variation".

the Student Desegregation Plan as examples of the data sources and my memo to you dated May 19, 1983. If the Boston Public Schools Profile, the Computer print-out and the April 11th Coakley letter, additional data sources, are needed we can forward them under separate cover.

In conclusion, I would stress the importance of Boston's response to our request to submit those documents which will allow us to evaluate the admissions process based on the specific, prescribed criteria as they appear on pages 9-11 of the Unified Plan. I strongly urge that, for the next scheduled monitoring of the Unified Plan implementation, priority be placed on the evaluation of Boston's program oversubscription policy and their policy for assigning students to programs. I would advise further study of the recruitment, placement and retention procedures of female students in non-traditional skills training programs.

Enc.

cc: Dr. David Cronin
Marlene Godfrey

7. Student Transportation

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Report on Boston Student Transportation Monitoring

The Procedural Manual for Monitoring states three objectives for monitoring of transportation under the Boston desegregation plan, but none of them can be met in time for the July Report to the Court. Boston is going through the process of adopting new transportation contracts, and the specific arrangements for transportation will be made over the next several months. The monitoring task will consist of determining to what extent these arrangements support the assignments already approved, including those of bilingual and special needs students, and those to support the half-time program at the Humphrey Occupational Resource Center. During July and August we will monitor to assure that arrangements are in place for full implementation in September, and we will request regular reports on the pattern of complaints received and how these complaints are responded to. Finally, we have recommended that the Citywide Parent Council make transportation monitoring one of its priorities for the next year.

Monitoring activities to date have been limited to reviewing the "requests for proposals" for transportation services, and the extensive narrative of the contracting process provided by Mr. Coakley (see following). These reviews have taken place on the basis of more than a dozen years of "after-the-fact" monitoring of Boston desegregation transportation for the purpose of approving 100% state reimbursement. In other words, the general shape of desegregation transportation in Boston has been followed closely by the Bureau, but without an involvement in the specific arrangements which now must be included in the monitoring.

No problems have yet appeared as a result of this new monitoring effort, but we will be especially attentive to the pattern of complaints and to any indication of possible labor troubles which might make transportation unreliable in the Fall.

Finally, the report on monitoring of safety and security issues raises concerns about student safety while on school buses, either as a result of inadequate supervision or as a result of attacks upon buses. While the latter are generally not characterized as "racial" - the perpetrators do not generally agree to be interviewed on their motivations - such incidents are to be taken with the utmost seriousness by anyone concerned with assuring effective implementation of the desegregation plan. I can recall my own children returning from school, time and again in the most difficult years of desegregation, with reports of stones through their bus windows, and am keenly aware of the determination of parents to protect their children from such dangers. The transportation monitoring effort will be closely associated with that of safety and security issues, to assure that the Court and law enforcement agencies have a full picture of any continuing problems.

Charles L. Glenn, Director
June 6th 1983

C Glenn
Fyd

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
John R. Coakley, Senior Officer

May 16, 1983

MEMORANDUM

TO: Robert Spillane

FROM: John Coakley John Coakley

SUBJECT: Recommendations of the Transportation Evaluation Committee

In May 1982 you recommended the formation of a Transportation Review Committee, and requested me to chair the committee composed of six school officials and one non-school official from the university or business sectors. You also directed that a consultant firm be hired to assist in the development of new transportation contracts for use in 1983 and thereafter. Over the next nine months the Transportation Review Committee and the consultant firm, Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co., cooperated to develop new documents reflective of most of the suggestions of the Reardon Review Committee's Report of January 1982 and designed to balance the dual requirements of safe, efficient and timely service with realistic cost controls.

On March 14, 1983 the School Committee of the City of Boston issued separate invitations for transportation proposals for the period 1983 to 1985, with options through August 31, 1987:

- for operating and maintaining some or all of approximately 500 school transportation vehicles furnished by the School Committee, and
- for furnishing out-of-city special needs transportation services for the Boston Public Schools.

Advertisements of the two proposals were placed in the City Record, Boston Globe, Boston Herald, New York Times, Washington Post, Chicago Tribune, Houston Post and Los Angeles Times. A news release was issued to all Boston media, including many suburban newspapers, and to various community organizations. A mailing list of over two hundred fifty companies had been developed by combining the lists of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co., the Senior Officer for Equal Opportunity, the Transportation Unit and the Massachusetts Department of Education. Each company on the mailing list was sent an invitation to obtain the proposed documents by phoning or writing a request or by coming in to School Headquarters. Approximately 33 persons obtained copies of the "in-city" contract documents, and approximately 35 persons received copies of the "out-of-city" proposals.

The bidding lasted until April 22, 1983 at which time the bids were opened and read aloud. Proposals were received from the following companies:

In-City Contract

- ARA Transportation, Mattapan/Philadelphia
- ATE Management, Cincinnati
- Boston School Bus, Framingham
- Boston Transportation, Medford
- LM Industries, Roslindale

Out-of-City Contract

- Boston Transit, Medford
- Park Transportation, Sharon/Boise
- T.H.E.M., Cambridge
- Transcomm, Cambridge
- Travel-On, Dorchester

In accordance with the plan of action agreed upon in May 1982, the Transportation Review Committee was expanded to a fourteen-member Transportation Evaluation Committee in April 1983. (A roster of the committee is attached.) The Transportation Evaluation Committee met on seven occasions between April 20, 1983 and May 9, 1983. Members were provided with background material and the proposals themselves. A representative of Peat Marwick assisted the group in developing weighted criteria for evaluating the so-called "non-cost" aspects of the proposals. A resource person prepared computerized analyses of the cost components of the proposals. Other resource members provided the Transportation Evaluation Committee with the results of telephone surveys of school systems served by the bidders. Finally, each bidder appeared before the committee to respond to questions of the members.

On May 9, 1983, thirteen of the fourteen members convened and voted on each of the two proposals.

Out-of-City Contract

The Transportation Evaluation Committee recommends to the Superintendent that the School Committee award the entire out-of-city special needs contract to Transcomm, Cambridge. However, members of the Transportation Evaluation Committee are very conscious of the low bid of Transcomm, and urge the Superintendent to emphasize the rights of the School Committee in Articles 12 and 16 of the Contract as they pertain to the term of a contract, conditions for early termination of a contract and remedies available to the School Committee in cases of nonperformance or noncomformance.

In-City Contract

The Transportation Evaluation Committee recommends to the Superintendent that the School Committee award the entire in-city transportation contract to ARA Management, Mattapan/Philadelphia. However, the Transportation Evaluation Committee places the following conditions on its vote:

- the Superintendent and the School Committee insist that ARA agree formally to acknowledge the supremacy of the transportation contract over any labor agreement, and to renegotiate those portions of any labor agreement which impinge upon safe, consistent and timely student transportation
- the Superintendent and School Committee insist that ARA agree to address the obvious inequities in Proposal Forms A and D whereby insufficient allocations are identified for management and maintenance staff, and questionable allocations are identified under the category of Labor Reserve
- the Superintendent and School Committee insist that ARA agree formally to abide by the intent of Contract Articles 3.4, 3.4.1 and 3.4.2, and agree to the designation of a mechanic or mechanics by the Director of Transportation to inspect all assigned vehicles, and also agree to assume responsibility for designated repairs and reasonable costs for these repairs
- absent agreement to the above conditions, the Superintendent and School Committee give consideration to awarding the entire contract to ATE Management, subject to further clarification in its proposal.

Under separate cover, I will send you materials necessary for your consideration (e.g., the proposals of the bidders) and for that of the School Committee.

A suggested schedule would be one wherein you arrive at a recommendation and convey same to School Committee no later than May 27, 1983, and that the School Committee arrive at its decision within two weeks of receipt of your recommendations.

bmj

Enclosure

cc: Members of the Transportation
Evaluation Committee

520

Membership of the Transportation Evaluation Committee: 4/29/83

Name	Affiliation
Kenneth Caldwell	Manager, Student Support Services
Alan Castaline	Chief Service Planning Officer, Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authorit
John Coakley	Senior Officer, Department of Implementat
Rosemarie Donovan	Parent designated by Massachusetts Advocacy Center
Edward Duprez	Associate Director, MASBO Cooperative Corportaion
Barbara Fields	Senior Officer, Equal Opportunity
Arthur Gilbert	Director, Transportation Unit
Mildred Griffith	Community Superintendent, District V
Charles Hambelton	Associate General Counsel
Lydia Mercado	President,Urban Planning Collaborative
Robert Peterkin	Deputy Superintendent for School Operations
Rosemarie Rosen	Deputy Superintendent for Finance and Administration
Robert Sperber	Special Assistant to the President of Boston University
Peter Van Delft	Parent designated by Citywide Parents Council

Resource Personnel (Non-Voting)

Michael Betcher	General Counsel
James Hickey	Member, Alexander Grant & Company
Robert McLaughlin	Associate Manager, Student Support Servi
Robert Murray	Planner
Frederick Quivey	Manager, Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.
Robert Rizzo	Assistant Director of Transportation

8. School Facilities

REPORT OF DESEGREGATION MONITORING

I. Monitoring Area

Construction, Renovation, and Closing of School Facilities

II. First Monitoring Objective

To determine whether all school closing measures ordered by the Court have been fully complied with.

A. METHODOLOGY - Department staff met with senior Boston staff on March 29, 1983, to discuss this matter.

B. FINDINGS - Boston staff reported their belief that all schools ordered closed have been closed.

C. COMMENDATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS - None

III. Second Monitoring Objective

To review all proposed construction, renovation and other school facility measures for consistency with the desegregation and other requirements of the Court.

A. METHODOLOGY - Department staff met with senior Boston staff on March 29, 1983, to discuss this matter

B. FINDINGS - Boston staff reported that there are no plans for construction at this time except for proposals to renovate and upgrade the facilities at Jeremiah Burke and Dorchester High Schools. A study of problems posed by asbestos is also in process.

Boston Superintendent Spillane in response to Department of Education requests has provided an interim secondary facilities long-range plan in which he provides assurances that the Burke and Dorchester will be needed facilities under any set of foreseeable circumstances. See the attached letter and its attachment dated May 3, 1983.

The Commissioner of Education has approved this plan and the School Building Assistance Bureau is assisting the City with the development of approvable applications. See the attached letter from Commissioner John Lawson dated May 19, 1983.

C. COMMENDATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS - None

IV. Third Monitoring Objective

To review the placement or proposed placement of any portable unit, or the rental of any space for instructional purposes, for consistency with the desegregation and other requirements of the Court.

A. *METHODOLOGY - Department staff met with senior Boston staff on March 29, 1983, to discuss this matter.*

B. *FINDINGS - Boston staff reports that no portables have been placed in recent years and no leasing of space inconsistent with desegregation orders and other Court requirements has been negotiated. Boston staff reported that Boston Latin Academy was under eviction notice from its rented Ipswich Street location but that successful resolution of that problem in the form of continuation of the lease for another year was anticipated.*

C. *COMMENDATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS - None*

V. *Fourth Monitoring Objective*

To determine the extent of compliance with outstading orders with respect to development of a Unified Facilities Plan, including a schedule of further school closings, a schedule of construction, renovation, replacements, as well as repair and refurbishing of all facilities, and a plan for secondary school utilization, in accordance with the provisions of the Manual for District Planning Activities and other requirements of the Court.

A. *METHODOLOGY - Department staff met with senior Boston staff on March 29, 1983, to discuss this matter.*

B. *FINDINGS - The need to develop a long-range facilities plan was discussed. At this time two planning groups are active in Boston. One is the Superintendent's planning group and the other is one headed by School Committee member Jean Sullivan McKeigue. Staff agreed that a secondary long-range facility plan be developed to complement work already done in the incomplete Unified Facilities Plan. No final document is anticipated before the fall of 1984. See the attached from Superintendent Spillane dated May 3, 1983, cited above, for furtner details on this matter.*

C. *COMMENDATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS - The Department should continue to press for resolution of this matter.*

Attachments

S.F. 4187

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

06288- Raftery

May 19, 1983

Dr. Robert R. Spillane
Superintendent of Schools
26 Court Street
Boston, Mass. 02108

Dear Dr. Spillane:

This is in response to your letter to me dated May 3, 1983, in which you set forth the interim long-range plan for Boston's secondary school facilities as it relates to the Jeremiah E. Burke and the Dorchester High Schools.

I note your assurance that the Burke and Dorchester High Schools shall be retained as parts of Boston's secondary school system because they are basically solid facilities located in the geographic and enrollment mainstream of the City. I note also your endorsement of the memorandum of John Coakley, Senior Officer for Desegregation, attached to your letter, as preliminary documentation for justifying the long-term need for these two schools.

It is my understanding that the matter of upgrading these two facilities, both academically and physically, has long been the focus of attention of both the School Committee and the School Department staff, and that the Boston Public Facilities Department which is preparing the projects for Board of Education approval and eventual bidding also regards the proposed projects as needed by the City.

Your letter and its attachments have been reviewed by me and by appropriate staff of the Department. Relying upon your assurances, I am pleased to state that I support your efforts to develop approvable applications for school construction projects at Burke and Dorchester High Schools and will be pleased to recommend such projects to the Board when approvable applications have been filed.

I suggest that Boston staff continue to work closely with staff of the School Building Assistance Bureau in the development of these proposals.

Sincerely,

John H. Lawson

John H. Lawson
Commissioner of Education

cc: Donald Manson
John Raftery
John Calabro
Franklin Banks
Charles Glenn
Samuel Pike

Copy Bob [illegible]

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
ROBERT R. SPILLANE

May 3, 1983

Mr. John H. Lawson
Commissioner of Education
Massachusetts Dept. of Education
1385 Hancock Street
Quincy, MA 02169

Dear Commissioner Lawson,

This letter concerns the proposed renovation projects at the Burke and Dorchester High Schools. Our staff and that of the Public Facilities Department of the City of Boston have proceeded with the project in anticipation of approval and reimbursement by the Board of Education through your School Building Assistance Bureau. Architectural plans have been designed and initial contracts are being prepared.

It is my understanding that the School Building Assistance Bureau is seeking some sense of our long-range plans for secondary school education in the Boston Public Schools. As you probably know, my own executive planning has been in a holding pattern pending the development of recommendations by the Educational Planning Group, a broad-based citizens' group chaired by School Committee Member Jean Sullivan McKeigue. Nonetheless, I can assure you that the Burke and Dorchester High Schools shall be retained as parts of our secondary school system. They are basically solid facilities located in the geographic and enrollment mainstream of our city. Please consider the attached memorandum from John Coakley, Senior Officer for Desegregation, as preliminary documentation for my justifying the long-term need for the two schools in question. I endorse his memorandum.

Additional evidence of our commitment to Burke and Dorchester High Schools can be found in the staffing programmatic support we are providing the two schools in the next academic year. Only recently, the entire senior staff met with the two Headmasters and Community Superintendent Griffith to review plans and needs. I believe that all present were satisfied with the commitments which were affirmed at the meeting.

I do urge you to obtain the requisite support of the School Building Assistance Bureau and approval of the Massachusetts Board of

26 COURT STREET, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108 • 726-6364 AREA 617

Education for the renovation projects at the two schools. There are particular improvements which are best effected during the summer months, and we are anxious to have such work commence as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Robert R Spillane

Superintendent of Schools

ab
Enclosure

xc: Robert Peterkin
John Coakley

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION
John R. Coakley, Senior Officer

May 3, 1983

MEMORANDUM

To: Robert R. Spillane

From: John R. Coakley John R Coakley

Subject: The Proposed Renovation of the Burke and Dorchester Facilities

Allow me to place this memorandum in context by providing you with some background on the issue of special remedial measures at Burke and Dorchester High Schools.

BACKGROUND

In a Draft Order of the Federal District Court on November 6, 1981, Judge Garrity indicated that following a series of hearings on the Burke and Dorchester High Schools the Court was

> "persuaded that special remedial measures are necessary at Burke and Dorchester High in order to meet the Courts dual objectives of desegregation and enhancement of educational opportunity."

The Draft Order further stated that

> "The School Department must, we believe, take special desegregative measures at both schools by devising new and attractive curricular programs."

The Draft Order concluded by directing the development and implementation of plans including "facility improvement plans" at the Burke and "recommendations for physical plant need" for Dorchester High and a date of April 15, 1982 was set for the parties to file such plans.

This Draft Order which was not a final order only because the parties offered to try to accomplish the Court's goals without a Final Order in essence established the priority for modernization and renovation of Dorchester High and Burke High.

On March 24, 1982 the School Department filed its plans for Burke and Dorchester High and began to implement those aspects of the Order for which it had full responsibility. The School Department

26 COURT STREET, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108 • 726-6200, EXT 5500, 726-6555, EXT. 5500 AREA 617

anticipated the cooperation of City and State parties to the case in those aspects of the plan that required joint activity.

The basic thrust and the high priority of the plans for Dorchester High and Burke High were designed to achieve the desegregation of the student populations and the enhancement of educational opportunity at these two high schools in District Five.

Specifically, plans for academic improvements were developed by the administration and faculty of the schools, and were then submitted to the Federal District Court. Changes in the schools in September 1982, and staffing and programmatic flexibility were provided. Further educational innovation is planned for 1983-84.

In addition, a change in assignment procedures for the two schools was accepted by the court and was implemented both in 1982-83 and for 1983-84. The new assignment patterns gave evidence of the commitment of the Federal District Court towards enhancing desegregation at Burke and Dorchester High Schools. Further, the implementation of the student assignment changes should be proof of the school system's commitment to the two schools.

Regarding the physical renovation of the two schools, these projects qualify under the special provision of Section 8B of Chapter 645 which in 1976 amended the State School Building Assistance Program to provide a separate and distinct priority for consideration of "school projects ordered or approved by the Court as necessary for desegregation." These projects, however, have not yet moved forward due to the requirements of a long-range plan as required by state regulations.

LONG RANGE PLANNING - BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

In regard to long-range plans for schools in Boston, it is clear that the secondary school component is an ongoing and incomplete item on the agenda of the Federal Court. As you know, the Executive Planning Team, chaired by Doctor Peterkin and me, has limited its activities until the Educational Planning Group formed by Mrs. McKeigue issues its recommendations. Nonetheless, it is possible to examine the long-term need for the Burke and Dorchester High Schools.

1. Secondary School Enrollment Trends

Our school system has been experiencing serious enrollment decline in recent years at the elementary and middle school levels. There is evidence that our kindergarten enrollment may have "bottomed-out" in 1981-82 and that our enrollment in grades 1 to 5 could rise somewhat after 1983-84. At the secondary school level we anticipate a "bottoming-out" of middle schools in 1985-86, and a levelling-off of high school enrollments before 1990.

The following chart is a blend of history and projection:

Date	Kindergarten	Grades 1 to 5	Grades 6 to 8	Grades 9 to 12
December 1977	8043	25429	17119	19496
December 1978	7783	24036	16121	19110
December 1979	7390	22507	15365	19051
December 1980	7392	21526	14651	19164
December 1981	5293*	20241	14128	18880
December 1982	4362**	20642	13654	18171
December 1983	4260	20050	13160	17475
December 1984	4450	20090	12115	17115
December 1985	4600	20470	11300	16105
December 1986	4740	20950	10690	15515
December 1987	4860	20625	11665	14705

* Return to the one-year kindergarten program; 16-month eligibility
** Twelve-month eligibility this year and thereafter

It is predictable that by 1992 - assuming that the trends currently evident in the lower grades continue -- our middle school population will be approximately 12,000 and our high school enrollment will be nearly 14,000. Incidentally, the historical data upon which our projections were based are taken from the low "actual enrollment" point of each school year from 1977 to 1982: mid-December. As you know, the official assigned enrollments of each October 1st are somewhat higher.

2. Secondary School Utilization

There has been controversy among the parties to the desegregation case whenever the subject of school capacities and utilization has been raised. This portion of my paper is susceptible to criticism by those who compute school space differently or who disagree with our utilization ratios. With that understanding, I offer the following on secondary schools:

a. High Schools

Assignable Capacity in 1983-84 = 21833
Projected Enrollment in 1983-84 = 17475
Utilization Ratio in 1983-84 = 80.0%

b. Middle Schools

Assignable Capacity in 1983-84 = 14279
Projected Enrollment in 1983-84 = 13160
Utilization Ratio in 1983-84 = 92.2%

c. Combined Secondary Schools (Total of "a" and "b")

Assignable Capacity in 1983-84 = 36112
Projected Enrollment in 1983-84 = 30635
Utilization Ratio in 1983-84 = 84.8%

We who have dealt with student assignment issues for some years consider a 75% utilization ratio to be defensible in an urban school system and an 80% ratio to be required. Some programmatic space in a school simply is not transferable. In our system, with significant numbers of bilingual education and special needs students, it is a reality in many of our schools that space must be allocated for programs which do not function at or close to an idealized capacity. Note that we serve ten different linguistic groups totaling 6495 students, and we provide services to 3083 substantially separate special needs students in ten major need categories, as well as 7514 students requiring special needs mainstream services.

3. Quality of Secondary School Space

I am not anxious to write in any detail on the quality of our facilities in this paper lest it be viewed as inhibiting to possible recommendations of the Educational Planning Group. However, there are no secrets concerning the physical limitations or potential of individual secondary schools. They have been studied intensively in part or in full at least three times since 1977: by George Collins for the Public Facilities Department, by Robert Murray and Joseph Carey for Superintendent Marion Fahey, and by James Breeden for Superintendent Robert Wood.

Please examine the following:

Initial *Date of Opening	High Schools	Middle Schools
Before 1900	0	1
1901 - 1920	2	8
1921 - 1940	7	13
Since 1940	7	2
Leased Property	1	0

* Some schools had additions or major renovations in later years.

Admittedly, this chart can be misleading because some schools (e.g., Cleveland) were initially opened in one era and were expanded or modernized in a later era. The Burke School was the last high school to be constructed before World War II. Exclusive of the one leased property, twenty three of the forty secondary schools are older than the Burke School. Dorchester High School is less easy to categorize. Using its initial opening date, Dorchester High school is one of the older secondary facilities; only thirteen of the forty schools are older. However, the school was expanded in 1958 and 1969, and in that sense only is somewhat newer than thirty of the forty schools.

The fact is, however, that even a casual observer would make the conjecture that reduction of secondary school capacity is more likely to occur at our current middle school level. The older middle schools are less desirable facilities than are the older high schools, by and large. Further, several of the older middle schools are located in areas that are not part of our prime enrollment sources. On the other hand, only four of our seventeen high schools are in Black neighborhoods. Future school closings cannot ignore the relationship between school locations and enrollment concentrations.

The data in the first part of this section are based on assigned enrollments in late January of 1983. (They may suggest seeming discrepancies with other data but are explained by the time difference and the differential between actual and assigned enrollments.)

Please note the following:

District	Grades	82-83 Public School Residents	82-83 District School Attendees
I	6-8	1519	1150
	9-12	2075	1121
	K-13	6548	4410
II	6-8	1741	1206
	9-12	2240	949
	K-13	7398	4732
III	6-8	1676	1404
	9-12	2526	1327
	K-13	7079	5264
IV	6-8	1509	1020
	9-12	2119	1001
	K-13	6654	4493
V	6-8	3084	2047
	9-12	4121	1582
	K-13	12979	8389
VI	6-8	1766	1554
	9-12	1986	911
	K-13	6897	5319
VII	6-8	1623	1147
	9-12	2202	962
	K-13	6975	4807
VIII	6-8	918	793
	9-12	1011	1057
	K-13	3400	3114
IX	6-8	-	3514
	9-12	-	9354
	K-13	-	17398

The Burke and Dorchester High Schools are located in District V which is by far the district with the largest public school base. Moreover, it is a rather compact district geographically. Most of the district is located within a larger area which I describe as the enrollment mainstream of the city: going south to north from the Milton line to Columbus Avenue in the South End, and from east to west from Dorchester Avenue to Hyde park Avenue and Washington Street (in Jamaica Plain and Roxbury).

A "difficulty" in analyzing the data above is the non-homogeneous nature of the school districts which were created for purposes of desegregation in 1975. The following chart was prepared by the Boston Redevelopment Authority. It provides census data by age by commonly-designated areas of the city. School District V corresponds roughly to the planning districts of North Dorchester and South Dorchester. Note carefully the potential and real school-age populations and you will observe the enrollment potential of Dorchester and Roxbury.

1980 TOTAL POPULATION BY AGE IN THE CITY OF BOSTON, BY PLANNING DISTRICT

Part A Planning Districts	Total Population	Under 5	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24
East Boston	32,115	1,639	1,734	2,196	2,698	3,079
Charlestown	13,364	703	732	984	1,228	1,403
South Boston	30,237	1,594	1,628	2,062	2,624	2,978
Central	21,661	570	563	635	1,155	2,581
Back Bay-Beacon Hill	30,178	397	261	296	2,532	6,677
South End	27,063	1,370	1,413	1,700	1,929	2,869
Fenway-Kenmore	30,823	325	168	159	8,230	11,720
Allston-Brighton	65,264	1,918	1,702	2,032	5,223	17,228
Jamaica Plain-	39,210	2,517	2,435	2,732	3,251	4,995
Parker Hill						
Roxbury	57,751	5,122	4,886	5,330	6,289	5,679
North Dorchester	23,758	1,798	1,689	2,005	2,407	2,521
South Dorchester	58,989	4,129	4,256	5,195	6,063	5,962
Mattapan	35,816	2,938	3,237	3,259	3,972	3,219
Roslindale	32,577	1,903	1,823	2,241	2,735	3,492
West Roxbury	31,289	1,317	1,278	1,840	2,242	2,907
Hyde Park	29,950	1,823	1,748	2,103	2,650	3,024
Planning District Totals	561,181	30,063	29,553	35,889	55,228	80,334
Harbor Islands & Crews of Vessels	1,748	2	0	2	246	73
Boston Total*	562,994	30,118	29,610	35,965	55,545	81,15

* Planning Districts may not sum exactly to City Total.

Another view of public school residential change may be garnered from the following data. The term "enrollment mainstream" was described above, although the table below embraces the area east of Dorchester Avenue from Andrew Square southward. The term "perimeter areas" refers to the rest of the city west of Hyde Park Avenue and Washington Street and north and east of Columbus Avenue. In summary, the perimeter areas include Roslindale, West Roxbury, most of Jamaica Plain, Mission Hill, Brighton, Allston, Fenway, Back Bay, Beacon Hill, North End, Bay Cove, Charlestown, East Boston and South Boston.

Public School Residential Change

Enrollment Mainstream		77/78	78/79	79/80	80/81	81/82	82/83
	gr. 6-8	10874	10261	9917	9516	8912	8667
	gr. 9-12	12453	12463	12687	12673	11418	11401
	gr. K-13	44534	43053	41709	41019	36827	36422
Perimeter Areas							
	gr. 6-8	6943	6335	5912	5603	5333	5176
	gr. 9-12	8261	7734	7770	7445	7224	6937
	gr. K-12	31025	28903	28244	26610	22090	21533
Total System							
	gr. 6-8	17817	16596	15829	15119	14245	13843
	gr. 9-12	20714	20197	20457	20118	18642	18341
	gr. K-13	75559	71956	69953	67629	58917	57975

Although there has been enrollment decline in the "enrollment mainstream", it has not been nearly as deep as in the rest of the city. For example, that area now provides 63% of our public school population in contrast to 59% five years ago and 57% in 1975-76. Secondary School enrollment in this area has declined by 14% in five years whereas it has gone down 20% in the perimeter areas. Moreover, students in the enrollment mainstream use the Examination Schools proportionately less than do students in the perimeter. Please note that only four high schools, including Boston Technical High School, are in the "mainstream area"; admittedly six others including the two Latins, are fairly close to that area. However, there is a decided disproportion between the location of our high schools and the enrollment of our students.

If one examines the public school residential change in an area arguably near the Burke and Dorchester High Schools -- all of present District V and parts of present Districts III and IV -- the following picture emerges:

Areas Proximate to Burke/Dorchester		77/78	78/79	79/80	80/81	81/82	82/83
	gr. 6-8	5306	5917	5676	5446	5036	4845
	gr. 9-12	7174	7255	7119	7109	6475	6561
	gr. K-13	25661	24448	23665	23274	20686	20383

Incidentally, a strong case could be made for perceiving a portion of present District VI as proximate to the Burke School. Such a determination would cause one to add approximately 350 middle school students and 500 high school students to the 1982-83 figures above.

The two high schools with a combined assignable capacity of 1930 students will not suffer for students, particularly when we move -- as we must -- to close aging facilities in an equitable manner, and especially if we seek to modify the outstanding Court Orders in a manner designed to enhance the vitality of district school vis-a-vis citywide schools. It is predictable that the Educational Planning Group will urge a shrinking of the citywide district. Moreover, demographic change continues in Dorchester and, as it does, it is likely that there will be a tendency for newer residents to utilize the local high schools more greatly than did the residents of very recent years and much more distant years.

I am confident that a rehabilitation of the two facilities in question will be in the best interests of our students and parents and of other taxpayers. We do need to retain the two schools for the long-term and can utilize them effectively for secondary education for some years to come.

I am sensitive to the possibility that this paper could be disseminated and, therefore, am reluctant to place in writing statements that could appear to be in premature conflict with forthcoming views of the Educational Planning Group, or that could needlessly upset members of various school communities. I can only say to you that there are several possible scenarios for the long-term utilization of secondary schools in Boston. The Burke and Dorchester facilities should and can be prominently and effectively displayed in each of the scenarios.

JRC:ab

9. School Safety and Security

SCHOOL AND SAFETY AND SECURITY MONITORING REPORT

INTRODUCTION

Monitoring compliance with Federal Court orders on Safety and Security has presented some difficulties for the monitor. The safety and security orders contained in the appendix of the December 1982 Disengagement Order were issued in December 1974 and reflect the safety and security concerns affecting desegregation at the time; these orders are less relevant to safety and security concerns affecting desegregation today. Generally, there have been few, if any, instances of crowds, hostile to desegregation or threatening violence, accumulating in or around public schools in South Boston or elsewhere in the city within the last five years or more. The Boston School Department has developed an efficient and sophisticated Department of Safety Services, which although in constant contact with the Boston Police Department, obviates the need for direct police intervention in most incidents occurring in or around public schools. Although there have been incidents in some schools which have been described in some incidents reports as racial in nature, no school reports regular and continuing racial conflicts which require constant attention.

This does not mean that Boston no longer has safety and security concerns which affect desegregation. There are, as stated,still sporadic racial incidents occurring in some schools which require attention.

Since the early days of desegregation there has been a definite shift in the kinds of security problems being faced, away from racially motivated, organized disruptions, towards random, crime-related incidents occurring in and around some schools. If one subscribes to the belief that even the perception of a lack of safety and security within and around a school affects the possibility of maintaining a racially desegregated student population then there are several schools which still face safety and security problems affecting desegregation.

BOSTON'S RESPONSE TO SAFETY AND SECURITY ORDERS TO BE MONITORED

Since initially reviewing the December, 1974, safety and security court orders with Boston school officials and finding them wanting, Boston has begun efforts to change those orders. With Department of Education support, they first sought to substitute for the December 1974 orders a revision of those orders issued in September, 1975. However, upon further review, they have communicated to this monitor their intention to modify the orders more drastically. We await further word on those proposed changes.

This report contains two parts. The first lists the original Court Orders of 1974, and indicates the current compliance status of each. The second part is more comprehensive and attempts to relate the Court's original concern with safety issues to the present situation of the Boston Public Schools. Six monitoring objectives developed by Department of Education staff are presented accompanied by the methodology, findings and recommendations pertinent to each.

SPECIFIC ORDERS TO BE MONITORED

1. Boston law enforcement in South Boston High and daily reports on numbers of law enforcement personnel assigned:

Status: There are no Boston law enforcement personnel or other law enforcementment personnel stationed in South Boston High. See monitoring objective number 4 more details.

2. Exclusion of all unauthorized persons from South-Boston -Roxbury District School:

Status: South Boston-Roxbury District has become District VI, now drawing students from Dorchester and South Boston. The issue of unauthorized persons in school buildings is covered under monitoring objectives 1 and 2.

3. Police prevention of all gatherings (3 or more), likely to disrupt school operations within 100 yards of South Boston schools and other public middle and high schools and fifty yards of all other schools:

Status: Monitoring objective 2 covers the preparedness of the Boston Public Schools security staff to enforce this order, although they have not had to enforce it in more than three years.

4. Inclusion in the student discipline code and enforcement of prohibitions against racial slurs.

Status: See monitoring objective 3.

5. Report to be filed January 6, 1975 on closing South Boston High in the event the safety of students cannot be assured.

Status: The report ordered was filed by the Boston Public Facilities Department and the Office of the Mayor on December 6, 1975.

6. Draft plan for use of bi-racial monitors in South Boston schools and other schools.

Status: Such a plan was implemented and abandoned at South Boston High reportedly because it did not ease racial tensions. The present situation does not seem to necessitate such a plan. City-wide Parent Council members now monitor schools which appear to have special racial or other safety problems. See objective 3.

MONITORING OBJECTIVES

1. To review monthly reports on school incidents, with special attention to those perceived as racial in nature.

Methodology

Daily Incident Log reports from January 3, 1983 through April 29, 1983, were provided by the Boston Public Schools Safety Service Department. These reports include the time and place (school bus number, etc.) of a reported incident and a concise description of the incident. The persons involved are described by race, sex and status ("B F student," "W M teacher," "O M trespassers," etc.), and incidents are categorized as: crimes against person, crimes against property, safety related, either on and off school property. Each incident is also given a control number, and the safety unit reporting the incident and the police area in which the incident occurs is noted (see sample form - Appendix III). At the end of the brief description of an incident, a disposition is given on how the incident was handled (e.g. "Boston Police Notified," "emergency suspension invoked," "Parents Notified," "Suspension Hearing Scheduled," etc.).

In addition, the Safety Service Department has at the monitor's request circled in red those incidents which, through investigation, have proven to have strong racial overtones. These investigations have consisted of interviews of those present concerning what we said and done.

The Department of Safety Services has provided each school with a Safety Procedural Manual which includes instructions on when and how to notify the Safety Department of incidents. There are twenty-five items listed which must be reported (see Appendix II).

In addition to reviewing these reports the monitor has also made on-site visits and talked with key staff at schools which have had higher numbers of racial incidents and other safety concerns. The monitor has also met with Dr. Peterkin, Deputy Superintendent of School Operations, Mr. Chistolini, Chief of Safety Services, and, some of his staff, and followed up these meetings with several telephone conversations. All of these conversations have focused on current safety and security concerns as they affect Boston desegregation and compliance with safety orders being monitored. The monitor has also had the opportunity to attend hearings conducted by the Safe Schools Commission in each of the nine districts. These hearings have included testimony from parents, teachers, administrators and others about major safety issues relating to the district schools.

Findings

Although there seems to be general consistency throughout the system in the reporting of incidents, there is evidence that there are some minor problems. The problems concern differing interpretations within one district of the kinds of things which should be reported. These problems are being monitored by the City-wide Parents Council, as they are being resolved among the school administrators, District Superintendent, Safety Department staff, and Central Office staff, with the intent of reaching a clear understanding of reporting responsibilities consistent with city-wide standards. The Department will continue to monitor this.

Of the seven-hundred and eighteen incidents reported between January 3, 1983 and April 29, 1983 --- incidents ranging from student illness, serious accidents and altercations, to assaults, substance abuse and robbery --- thirty-four (4.7% of total) incidents have been denoted as racial in nature (see Appendix IV). Twenty-five of these incidents occurred at twelve school sites, two occurred at MBTA sites and seven occurred off school property while students were enroute to or returning from schools. There were 12 reported bus stonings, only one of which was found to be racial in nature. During this time there were also 50 reported (7.9%) ARA bus incidents involving school discipline code violations or legal infractions.

Of the thirty-four racial incidents reported, three involved attempted or actual robbery, two involved threats of bodily harm, and twenty-nine involved altercations (fights) or assaults.

'Racial' Labels

In order to label an incident as racial, investigations are conducted by the Boston Safety Department, including interviews of those present regarding what was said and done. There is little doubt that the decision to label an incident racial or not is sometimes a judgement call by the investigator. This monitor has no reason to doubt that in most cases valid decisions were made about which incidents were labeled racial and which were not, based on information gathered about the investigation process and some spot checking of incidents. The one group of incidents in which there may be greater doubts are the bus stonings, primarily because there is no way to interview perpetrators who are never caught. The only things the investigator has to go on in most stoning cases are: (1) where the incident occurred, (2) who (by race) was on the bus at the time of the stoning, (3) who (by race) was throwing stones, and (4) whether racial epithets were shouted. On the basis of these criteria most stonings were not labeled as racial because the stone throwers were the same race as the majority of the bus occupants.

Safety on School Buses

At the safe Schools Commission hearings, the issue of safety on the school buses has continually arisen. Parents, particularly, have complained that fights, assaults, use of controlled or illegal substances are taking place on certain bus runs due, primarily, to a lack of supervision. Although there are specific rules of bus safety and conduct spelled out in the Safety Procedural Manual, some parents assert that these rules are routinely broken on some bus runs and that bus drivers can not drive and supervise unruly students at the same time. Many of those parents have asked that bus monitors be returned to at least certain troublesome runs.

According to Boston school officials contacted, bus monitors were eliminated two years ago because:

1. they were not always needed and they were not always effective in preventing disturbances (and in some cases even provoked confrontation);

2. they spent a good part of the day between runs with not much to do; and

3. funds to pay them had to be built into an operating budget that was already being cut. (Although funds for the bus monitors were reimbursed by the state, there was some difficulty noted in actually making the money available to the school system because of a complex reimbursement process through city hall.)

As previously stated, the 50 reported incidents involving legal or other infractions on ARA buses constitute only 7.9% of the total number of incidents reported for this period. An examination of reported bus incidents does reveal repeated incidents occurring on some school bus runs (as many as four bus incidents reported for one school during this period), which might suggest that certain runs do need some additional attention. However, the 50 incidents cited occurred in 26 different school runs, covering all districts except eight. Based on the kinds of reports heard from parents and some teachers and administrators regarding discipline problems on school buses and the relatively small number of reported incidents, this monitor could not determine whether the discipline problems cited by parents and others were exaggerrated or whether the reporting of incidents on buses is underutilized and not representative of what is actually occurring on some bus runs. At any rate, since busing is a key element of the desegregation plan and concerns about safety have been expressed about some bus runs, Boston should investigate the legitimacy of these concerns and either formulate plans remedying unsafe conditions or correct misperceptions about safety on school buses. Remedies might include the hiring and training of bus monitors, but they may also include the stationing of the school administrator outside when the buses arrive and when they leave to supervise the orderly filing of students into and out of school, or the staggering of bus arrivals and departures to prevent possible conflicts between students from different neighborhoods. These suggestions were made at the Safe SChools Commission hearings.

Unauthorized Persons in Schools

A review of the incidents reported submitted indicates that there are cases of unauthorized persons getting into some schools. In most cases, these unauthorized entries involve students from other schools and in most cases, there is no evidence of intent to disrupt for racially motivated reasons. Those schools which appear to have a greater problem with unauthorized entries have had extra security staff assigned --- sometimes temporarily, sometimes permanently. These security staff usually circulate throughout the building checking on possible hiding places and making sure that during class time, hallways and unused classrooms and other areas are empty. Students who are not in class are asked either to present a pass or to move on to their classes. Most unauthorized entries appear to take place at schools in which there are multiple entrances some of which must remain unbolted for fire safety reasons. The physical plant of some schools, such as English High, make it particularly difficult to prevent entry (because of multiple entrances) or to find and remove unauthorized persons (because of 10 floors and many staircases and hallways). The assignment of extra security staff to buildings in which this is a problem does appear to have a positive impact.

In most cases, this monitor has found that school entrances are locked and entry can be gained only by ringing or knocking and stating your business to an office person assigned to the front door. People without specific appointments must talk with the building administrator before further access to the building is allowed. Unauthorized entry for the purpose of disrupting for anti-desegregation or racially motivated reasons has not surfaced as an important concern, either in the on-site monitoring visits or in the Safe Schools Commission hearings.

Recommendations/Commendations

In general the incident reporting process appears to be working well and the responses to incidents are well documented and seemingly appropriate. The Department of Safety Services is to be commended on the efficiency, speed and appropriateness with which they carry out their responsibilities in incident-report training, data gathering and follow-up.

We will continue to monitor the resolution of the problem in one district of inconsistent reporting criteria.

2. To confirm the adequacy of arrangements for dealing with race-related incidents, including for example the existence of an emergency reporting procedure and action plan for school and law enforcement personnel.

Methodology

In order to achieve this objective the monitor requested that the Department of Safety Services provide a brief report concerning the preparedness of the school department to respond to racial disturbances in and around public schools. This request was followed with a visit by the monitor to the Department of Safety Services Office at Madison Park High and discussion of Safety issues, with Mr. Chistolini, the Chief of Safety Services, and Mr. Sisco, his Coordinator of Investigations. The report requested is Appendix I. In addition the monitor visited several schools which have had racial incidents to see, in specific cases, how racial incidents were handled.

Findings

As stated in the introduction, within this monitoring period, there were no incidents involving anti-desegregation crowds attempting to disrupt school operations. There have been a number of spontaneous racial incidents limited to a few middle and high schools which have involved assaults and fights among several students and have had the potential, through the gathering of crowds, for involving greater numbers. It is to the credit of alert staff members, responsive Boston School Police, and a restrained student body at the schools involved that disruptions of this kind were quickly contained; emergency suspensions were invoked, including removal of the involved students from the building, and a return to relatively normal operations. The procedures for calling for help, invoking emergency suspensions and the follow-up investigations are described in the Safety Procedural Manual distributed to all headmasters and principals. The Chief of Safety Services states that his office has the capacity to dispatch two teams of Boston School Police, 32 officers in all, to be on-site at any emergency within four minutes. Further, all Boston School Police Officers have been trained by the Boston Police, the U. S. Justice Department, and the Massachusetts Criminal Justice Training Department, in crowd control measures and crisis intervention techniques.

The Department of Safety Services also maintains direct high priority lines to the Boston Police Department, especially the community disorders unit, and direct lines to the MBTA police. It appears that the procedures established, staff training and connections with outside law enforcement agencies have paid off in those cases where there was the potential for large-scale racial violence.

Preventing Racial Violence

While the Boston Safety Department has done much to develop effective ways to respond to incidents involving racial violence, steps taken to prevent racial violence are few and of limited scope. In schools such as Charlestown High and English High where there are have been racial incidents, efforts to build effective parent organizations and effective student leadership activities involving substantial numbers of parents and students have largely failed. Both schools cite lack of funds as the reason more programs in student leadership, counseling and parent and community outreach have not been attempted or developed. In their inability to develop effective student organizations and parent involvement the two schools are not unlike other schools in Boston where racial violence is less evident.

South Boston High

In South Boston High, where the history of racial violence has been extensive and the hostility of the neighborhood to desegregation has been high, there has been only one reported racial incident (January 3 - April 30). The headmaster explains the relative absence of racial or other forms of disruptions through:

- the counseling orientation of the staff
- the increased intervention of outside health and social agencies to head off problems from home and neighborhood before they spill over into the school, and
- the extra staff provided through the court order which, among other things oversees in-house suspensions and other counseling oriented responsibilities

To that list, this monitor would add:

- the tone established by the headmaster and his staff which promotes a school climate in which students and staff treat each other with respect and humanity, and in which solving the problems of living together harmoniously becomes a focus for learning.

In addition to these factors, South Boston High has many special programs, some funded through supplementary funds (Chapter 636) and others requiring little or no additional funding. Many of these are focused on making learning more relevant and exciting for students (e.g. marine biology, writing program). Many staff donate after-school hours to make these programs work.

The Headmaster has also taken quiet but effective steps to work with South Boston parents and community leaders. His efforts have helped to insure the absence of organized disruption at the school and kept behavior likely to accellerate racial violence to a minimum. The composition of the staff and the way they interact reflect the racial diversity and harmony which he expects his students to emulate.

Need for Alternative Programs/Schools

The assertion has been made by many school administrators and teachers that the real safety and security problems of schools, both racial and non-racial, are caused by a small percentage of the total student population (estimates range from 10% to 20%) which does not respond either to the academic requirements or the behavioral expectations of a regular middle or high school program. Consequently there has been a strong cry for an increase in counselling, in-house alternative programs, and separate alternatives schools for these very difficult students. These same administrators, teachers and the Chief of Safety Services cite an increase in criminal behavior in and around certain schools, and the spilling over of neighborhood and family problems into the schools as the major safety issues to be dealt with now. It has also been implied that if many of these "hard-core" students were either removed from the regular school or contained in special programs, perceptions of unsafe and insecure conditions at certain schools would be greatly reduced.

One Boston school staff person involved with discipline at a high school cited the example of a student who has been suspended twenty-six times since school began in September. Despite repeated requests, the parent of this student has yet to meet with school officials to discuss the students problems. The message is that if the student is constantly disrupting the educational process of other students, pre-empting most of the teachers time and energy, and is receiving little or no support from home in resolving his/her problems, then special measures should be taken. Some staff members have suggested greatly increasing the scope of counseeling, stressing the development of job survival skills as well as basic skills. Other staff members have suggested a range of options --- going from in-house suspensions, in-house alternative programs to separate schools for very difficult students. The bottom line for all of these suggestions has been a plea for increased funding for setting up such programs and schools.

Recommendations/Commendations

The Department of Safety Services and the building administrators and staff must be commended for the speed and efficiency with which racial incidents have been handled. In many instances more extensive racial problems have been avoided because of their appropriate responses.

On the other hand there is a lack of specific efforts to prevent racial violence in those schools where there have been sporadic racial incidents. The one exception noted by this monitor is South Boston High where increased services, and greater control of elements of the school climate, have paid off in fewer racial incidents. This monitor recommends that:

1. certain schools which have had sporadic racial violence be targeted by the Central Office for help in finding funding (Chapter 636 and other sources) and other resources for special programs designed to bring students, staff and parents together in preventing racial violence.

2. a search be launched to find program models both in the city and from elsewhere which can help to reduce violence within schools, and that these models and ways of funding and implementing them be discussed with the building administrators at those schools where violence is high and racial incidents have occurred.

3. serious thought and planning go into increasing the number of effective alternative programs and schools and other methods to change the public perception of a lack of safety within certain schools, which adversely affects desegregation at those schools.

This monitor is aware that some of these recommendations are already being implemented in part and that lack of funds prevents further expansion. However, it is still suggested that more aggresive steps can be taken by the Boston Central Office, especially in working with building administrators in schools where racial and other forms of violence are more serious and preventive measures are scarce.

3. To confirm that the student discipline code and its implementation deal adequately with racial slurs and other actions tending to create race-related incidents.

Methodology

By examining the citywide Code of Discipline and checking with Mr. Chistolini, the Chief of Safety Services, on the number of suspensions for racial slurs, the monitor was able to establish that a prohibition of racial slurs is included in the Code of Discipline as a suspendable offense and that that part of the code is being enforced in at least some cases. Additional information about the implementation of the student discipline code was also provided through the Department of Education desegregation monitor in the Student Discipline area, and through attendance at the Safe Schools Commission hearings.

Findings

Between September 1982 and February 1983, there were throughout the system sixteen suspensions for violation of "7.7" of the student discipline code --- the prohibition of racial slurs likely to cause violence. One-third of these suspensions were from Charlestown High School, where sporadic racial incidents have occurred. A final report on citywide suspensions for this reason will be available at the end of the school year.

From the suspension data alone one cannot determine if "7.7" of the Student Discipline Code is being consistently enforced throughout the system. The Chief of Safety services has also stated that, while "racial slurs" is a suspendable offense, it does not mean automatic suspension. The building administrator has broad discretionary powers in determining the specific disciplinary action taken for a violation of the discipline code. As the code states, suspension is a 'last resort' measure, and as the one racial incident which occurred at South Boston High during the monitoring period reflects, parent conferences and other measures designed to change behaviors and attitudes are sometimes attempted first. This means that finding documentation of disciplinary responses to violations of "7.7" may be difficult, if a suspension is not involved and the violation does not merit an incident report. To further cloud the issue, suspensions for "racial slurs" only become a part of the official record, if other more serious violations (e.g. causing physical injury to another possession of a dangerous weapon) do not occur at the same time; the more serious violation becomes the cause for suspension.

While some of the administrators, teachers, and parents providing testimony for the Safe Schools Commission hearings felt the Code of Discipline was not working generally, this monitor did not hear specific references to 7.7 of that code. Evidence from the hearings has indicated that enforcement of the Code of Discipline does vary from school to school and within schools, but no specific evidence has been found that racial slurs likely to cause violence are not being consistently dealt with. This monitor has also found some evidence, particularly in those schools with a high number of reported incidents, that some teachers and administrators are not enforcing some code of discipline violations, because of the amount of time, paperwork, and energy it takes to suspend or otherwise discipline students. In some cases, only those violations of the code perceived as more serious or threatening, (e.g. stealing, assault, possession of dangerous weapons) are being acted upon, while those perceived as less serious, are sometimes ignored. Racial-name-calling, if it is limited to that, may be perceived as one of the less serious code violations in light of the number and seriousness of code violations and legal infractions occurring in some schools.

4 To review quarterly reports on deployment of law enforcement personnel in South Boston schools.

Status:

As stated in the Introduction under Specific Orders, there are no Boston law enforcement personnel stationed in any public schools. Instead, the Boston school police are deployed in the manner represented in Appendix V. These officers may be temporarily or permanently moved from one building to another as needs dictate.

5. To confirm that plans exist to close South Boston High School or any other school in the event that safety cannot be assured.

Status:

As indicated in the Introduction under Specific Orders, the plan for closing South Boston High was submitted as on December 6, 1975. Plans for closing other schools appear to be unnecessary.

6. To review the adequacy of provision for bi-racial monitors in troubled schools.

Status:

The City-wide Parents Council is actively monitoring those schools in which racial and other kinds of problems appear more serious. The use of bi-racial monitors has become a standard CPC procedure for monitoring, and efforts have been made to use Chinese and Hispanic monitors where issues affecting students of those ethnic heritages are being investigated. According to the CPC Executive Director Jim Stanton, it is important to have trained, competent monitors of all ethnic backgrounds to insure balanced reporting of events, and more direct communication with those affected by a problem.

Franklin F. Banks

May - 1983

Apeendix I

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT
SCHOOL OPERATIONS
ROBERT S. PETERKIN

April 29, 1983

Franklin F. Banks
Boston Desegregation Monitor
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education
1385 Hancock Street
Quincy, MA 02169

Dear Mr. Banks:

Please find attached a report from John Chistolini on the thrust of the Department of Safety Services and its procedures and capacity to handle race related incidents involving large crowds within and outside the Boston Public Schools.

The procedures for handling incidents of a large nature are consistent for race related incidents as well as incidents which are caused by other factors. Given our experience over the last ten years, the Department of Safety Services has evolved from a reactive arm of the administration to a proactive and professional organization dedicated to protecting the safety of Boston school children and staff.

Under separate cover I have requested that John Chistolini submit to you a copy of the Safety Manual which is distributed to each building Principal and Headmaster. This manual, collected and updated annually, includes all of the procedures of the Department of Safety Services in responding to problems of a safety related nature, as well as forms for the reporting of incidents and the like. Being updated annually, it is returned to Principals and Headmasters with an orientation at our annual workshop for administrators.

If you have any questions on the attached procedures for dealing with incidents, or on the Safety Manual, please call me or John Chistolini.

Once again, I thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Robert S. Peterkin
Deputy Superintendent
School Operations

RSP/jMc
Encl.
cpy: Superintendent Robert Spillane
Senior Officer John Coakley

26 COURT STREET, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02103 • 725-6200 EXT. 5330 AREA 617

SCHOOL CO

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF SAFETY SERVICES

April 4, 1983

JOHN A. CHISTOLINI

To: Robert S. Peterkin, Deputy Superintendent/Operations

From: John A. Chistolini, Chief of Safety Services

Re: Request from State Desegregation Monitor

The following is respectfully submitted in response to the request of Mr. Franklin F. Banks, State Desegregation Monitor for information on the subject of Safety and Security.

The Department of Safety Services has evolved into an integral element of the school community. The primary mission of the Department continues to be that of support for Community District Superintendents and Building Administrators in all matters related to safety and security. This general objective has been accomplished by providing professional and trained personnel, established operating procedures, technical advice and incident investigation. These mentioned resources have all contributed in restoring credibility in the Boston Public Schools and aided the stability which has been evidenced during the 1982-83 school year.

The services of the Department are provided directly to approximately seventy (70) schools on a daily basis through a sophisticated deployment plan. Immediacy of response allows for services at the remaining, lower priority schools of the system on an as needed basis.

The Crime Prevention role served by Department of Safety Services personnel has been most effective in reducing the number of "in-school" incidents. The aggresive action of security personnel in dealing with school offenders, support from building administrators in disciplinary matters and a commitment on the part of Central Administration in dealing with serious school offenders have all contributed to this reduction.

Conversely, however, incidents external to, but directly effecting the schools are increasing in number and in seriousness. It is clear that an urban educational setting reflects many of the serious crime problems of the city at large.

This Department is continuing its efforts to raise the professional standards of all personnel and maintain essential manning levels.

The majority of incidents reported in the Boston Public Schools during the period January 1, 1983 through March 31, 1983 have not been of a racial nature. They can be categorized as criminal and non-criminal offenses. The fact that parties in a criminal incident (principal-victim) happen to be of a different race doesn't necessarily constitute a racial incident.

The determination in labeling school related incidents as racial or non-racial is subject to different interpretation.

The large scale racial disruption which was commonplace in the early days of desegregation are no longer a disruptive factor with which to be contended.

The Department operates under procedures which cover the subject of crowd and demonstration control. These standard operating procedures are in compliance with statutes and ordinances which cover the subjects of crowd control, civil disorders and unlawful assembly. The Safety Department's resources have proven effective in containing incidents which occur within the schools, safe guard the perimeter of school property, and quickly return a school to normal operations. This has been accomplished through team policing at specific school sites, versatile deployment patterns, a sophisticated communications system, rapid response (six (6) to ten (10) augmenties within seven (7) minutes) and an established and adhered to para-military chain of command.

A realized objective of this Department has been to restrict problems external to the school building. Members of the Department maintain a keen vigilance and are "turned-in" to detect warning indicators which precipitate any large scale disturbance.

The Department has developed a close working relationship with key members of the school and police community and regularly share information. These relationships have been built on an appreciation of each agency's role, duty and responsibility over a period of years. The availability and responsiveness of the Safety Department to all elements of the community have effected a communications link-up (intelligence) which will preceed any large group response to a rare related incident.

It must be mentioned that the membership of this Department is racially balanced and is representative of each neighborhood of the city.

Safety and security plans developed for each school building include contingency capabilities for buildings in the event of an emergency. Guidelines for these plans are set forth in the Department of Safety's Procedural Manual and technical advice is available as part of the support service to each school administrator.

Members of this Department have received extensive training in crisis intervention and a humanistic approach to law enforcement. These acquired skills are seen as tools to reduce the plausability of large scale disruptions. In the event an incident involves large crowds external to the school it would realistically tax the resources of this Department. Should such an incident occur, the mutual aid contingency plans between the Department of Safety Services and the Boston Police Department would be effected.

I believe this submission will provide a responsible response for information requested by Mr. Banks. Please advise if further data is required.

JAC:bj

Appendix II

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DEPARTMENT OF SAFETY SERVICES

EMERGENCY RESPONSE UNIT OF
BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
445-9795

WHEN TO NOTIFY

NOTIFY IN CASE OF THESE SITUATIONS/INCIDENTS

1. ARREST
2. ARSON
3. ASSAULT
4. BOMB THREAT
5. COMMUNITY SAFETY/SECURITY CONCERNS
6. DEMONSTRATIONS
7. DRUG USE ABUSE
8. EXTORTION
9. FIRE
10. INJURY (SERIOUS ENOUGH TO REQUIRE TREATMENT BEYOND SCHOOL NURSE)
11. MAJOR DISORDER
12. MEDICAL EMERGENCY SERVICE, REQUEST FOR AMBULANCE
13. POLICE ASSISTANCE, REQUEST FOR
14. ROBBERY
15. SEX OFFENSE
16. SCHOOL CLOSING (EMERGENCY)
17. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REGARDING SAFETY/SECURITY, REQUEST FOR
18. THREATS
19. TRESPASSERS

20. TRANSPORTATION INCIDENTS (SERIOUS)
21. UNSAFE CONDITIONS
22. VANDALISM
23. WALK-OUT
24. WARNING INDICATORS
25. WEAPONS

---OTHER EMERGENCY---

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS-SAFETY ERVICE DEPT. 55 NEW DUDLEY ST. ROXBURY

DAILY INCIDENT LOG

ATE______________

AY______________

John A. Christolini

IME ORTING	ON SCHOOL PROPERTY	CONTROL NUMBER	UNIT REPORTING	POLICE AREA	

Appendix IV

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

RACIAL INCIDENTS

(January 3, 1983 - April 30, 1983)

M - Male
F - Female
O - Oriental
H - Hispanic
B - Black
W - White

PLACE	DATE	CONTROL #	TYPE	PERSONS INVOLVED	ACTIONS TAKEN*
DISTRICT I					
Brighton High	3/29	14021	Threatened altercation (dangerous weapons)	Several W/M students Several O/M students	Altercation prevented by Security Police Security expanded Investigation
Rogers Park (Brighton)	4/14	15081	Assault & Battery (dangerous weapon)	O/M student W/M student	W/M stud. suspended Parental Conference
Mission Hill	4/15	15261	Racial harassment	Several B/M students (Brighton H.) Several W/M Students (Mission H.)	Community disorders unit notified Boston Safety Dept. Investigation
DISTRICT III					
Irving Middle	2/15	11273	Assault & Battery Trespassing	5 W/M 2 B/M students	Additional security units assigned Investigation Community disorders unit notified
Cummins Highway	2/14	11213	Assault & Battery (rocks thrown)	12-15 unidentified W/M 1 B/M student	Investigation Extra security units assigned
DISTRICT IV					
Rogers Middle	4/6	14604	Threats of bodily harm (dangerous weapon)	2 B/M students 2 W/M students	Suspension hearing

PLACE	DATE	CONTROL #	TYPE	PERSONS INVOLVED	ACTIONS TAKEN*
DISTRICT IV (continued)					
Hyde Park H.	1/3	08304	Racial slurs	2 B/M students 2 W/M students	Emergency suspensions Parent conferences
	1/4	08334	Insults Altercation	1 B/M student 1 B/F student 2 W/M students	Emergency suspensions for males parent conferences
	1/6	08594	Insults Altercation	1 W/M student 1 B/M student	Emergency suspensions
DISTRICT V					
Near O'Hearn Elementary	2/18	11785	Harassment with snowballs	30 B/M + B/F 4 W/M students (O'Hearn)	Security Unit monitors area
Elm Hill St.	4/6	14519	Bus stoning	Group of B/M	Investigation bus monitored for a week
DISTRICT VI					
S. Boston H.	3/3	12076	Racial insults altercation	1 W/F student 1 B/F student	Parental conferences
McCormack	1/6	08586	Attempted assault & battery (dangerous weapon)	1 B/F student 1 W/M student	B/F suspended
DISTRICT VII					
Edwards	1/10	08947	Disruption of assembly, altercation	1 B/M student 1 W/M student	Both suspended
Charlestown H.	2/16	11437	Altercation	1 W/F student 1 B/M student	B/M suspended
	3/28	13887	Assault & Battery	1 B/M student 2 W/M students	Suspension hearing
	3/29	13947	Insults, altercation Assault & battery (dangerous weapon)	3 W/M students 2 B/M students	2 B/M arrested all suspended additional security assigned community supt. sets up hearing

PLACE	DATE	CONTROL #	TYPE	PERSONS INVOLVED	ACTIONS TAKEN
DISTRICT VII (continued)					
Charlestown H. (continued)	3/30	14117	Assault & Battery (dangerous weapon)	4 B/M students 3 W/M students 3 W/M school police 1 B/F school police	5 students arrested Parent conferences
MBTA	2/3	10707	Assault & Battery	3 unidentified W/M, 2 B/M students (Edwards)	Security assigned to Edwards
Columbus Ave.	2/17	11567	Assault & Battery	1 H/M student (Quincy), 1 unidentified W/M	Investigation
DISTRICT IX					
English H.	1/10	09089	Assault	2 unidentified B/M , 1 W/M student, 1 W/M school police	Investigation
	1/11	09139	two racial disruptions	------	Extra security assigned
	1/27	10269	Assault & Battery	2 unidentified B/M, 1 W/M student	Investigation
Hernandez	3/22	13309	Assault	1 unidentified B/F, 3 O/F students	Security monitor area
Madison	1/19	09699	Assault & Battery	3 unidentified B/M, 1 W/M student	Investigation
	1/25	10109	Trespassing Attempt. Robbery Assault & Battery	2 B/M (Dorchester High) 1 W/M student	2 B/M arrested
	2/9	10999	Assault & Battery	8 unidentified B/M, 2 W/M students	Investigation

PLACE	DATE	CONTROL #	TYPE	PERSONS INVOLVED	ACTIONS TAKEN
DISTRICT IX (continued)					
Madison (continued)	2/14	11229	Assault & Battery (dangerous weapon)	2 B/M students 1 W/M student	2 B/M arrested + suspended
	4/15	15239	Attempted Armed Robbery	4 unidentified B/M, 1 W/M student	Investigation
Umana	1/28	10339	Assault & Battery	1 W/F student, 5 unidentified B/F	Investigation
Park St. MBTA	2/16	11339	Assault & Battery	1 W/F student/ (Copley), 1 unidentified B/M	MBTA Police notified Investigation
Palace Rd.	3/15	12809	Robbery & Assault	6-10 unidenti- B/M, 5 W/M students (Latin)	Investigation Increased security surveillance
ARA Bus	4/21	15559	Assault & Battery	2 unidentified B/M, 2 W/M students	ARA notified Investigation
MBTA-Mattapan	3/8	12434	Altercation	1 W/M, 1 B/M student (Tileston)	MBTA police notified Security assigned temp. to station

*Other actions and follow-up may have occurred after official reports were filed. These follow-ups are covered in addenda to the original reports.

Appendix V

SAFETY SERVICES PERSONNEL DEPLOYMENT

BLUE ZONE

HOURS	UNIT NO.	OFFICER	PRIMARY	SECONDARY
7:00 - 3:00	56	SGT. M. Hennessey	English High	
7:30 - 3:30	96	S. Ammidown	English High	Hurley
7:30 - 3:30	66	L. Tate	English High	Bus 968 - Matt.Sq
7:00 - 3:00	57	E. Conlin	English High	Bus Stoning Detai
7:30 - 3:30	95	J. Stewart	English High	McKay School
6:30 - 2:30	50	K. Bourque	Latin School	
8:00 - 4:00	78	P. Janey	English High	N. Hale
7:15 - 3:15	55	K. Devlin	English High	Farragut
7:15 - 3:15	58	M. Correa	English High	Tobin
7:00 - 3:00	14	SGT. D. Bilotas	Brighton High	
7:30 - 3:30	52	W. Hickey	Brighton High	Taft
7:30 - 3:30	51	D. Howell	Brighton High	Jackson-Mann
7:30 - 3:30	54	M. Johnson	Brighton High	Hennigan
7:30 - 3:30	83	N. McDougal	Boston Latin Acad.	
8:00 - 4:00	40	J. Rateguiz	Hennigan	

Appendix V (cont.)

SAFETY SERVICES PERSONNEL DEPLOYMENT

ORANGE ZONE

HOURS	UNIT NO.	OFFICER	PRIMARY	SECONDARY
7:15 - 3:15	19	SGT. W. Smith	Dorchester High	
7:30 - 3:30	76	T. Sanabria	Marshall	Mather
7:15 - 3:15	53	J. Gutierrez	W. Wilson	Fifield
7:15 - 3:15	70	J. Oliver	G. Cleveland	Holland
8:00 - 4:00	72	Jos. Jones	Holland	Mather
7:15 - 3:15	103	K. Partello	G. Cleveland	Marshall
7:30 - 3:30	67	C. Calloway	Dorchester High	S. Greenwood
7:15 - 3:15	68	W. Kelley	Dorchester High	Fifield
7:30 - 3:30	13	D. Flakes	Fifield	S. Greenwood
7:15 - 3:15	18	SGT. S. Bell	Hyde Park High	
7:30 - 3:30	49	K. Winn	Hyde Park High	Chittick
7:30 - 3:30	64	G. Williams	Hyde Park High	Thompson - Taylor
7:15 - 3:15	45	M. Harrell	Tileston	P.A. Shaw
8:00 - 4:00	74	A. Almeida	Thompson	Dist. 4 Trans.
8:00 - 4:00	75	G. Smallwood	Mattahunt	
8:00 - 4:00	73	K. Baker	Lewenberg	
7:15 - 3:15	65	W. Murphy	Hyde Park High	Rogers - Channing

Appendix V(cont.)
SAFETY SERVICES PERSONNEL DEPLOYMENT

GREEN ZONE

HOURS	UNIT NO.	OFFICER	PRIMARY	SECONDARY
7:15 - 3:15	62	OIC H. Strickland	West Roxbury High	
7:30 - 3:30	44	J. Wallace	West Roxbury High	R.G. Shaw
7:00 - 3:00	59	S. Graham	West Roxbury High	W. Irving
7:00 - 3:00	94	B. Butler	West Roxbury High	
7:15 - 3:15	17	SGT.D. Johnson	Jamaica Plain High	
7:15 - 3:15	82	S. Harper	Curley	Agassiz
7:30 - 3:30	61	J. Vasquez	Jamaica Plain High	Ellis - Kennedy
7:15 - 3:15	90	J. Kane	Roosevelt	Fuller
7:00 - 3:00	101	L. Catron	Jamaica Plain High	Parkman
7:15 - 3:15	63	P. Collins	Jamaica Plain High	Longfellow

YELLOW ZONE

7:15 - 3:15	9	SGT. T. Gomperts	Charlestown High	
7:15 - 3:15	31	A. Skrine	Charlestown High	Blackstone
7:00 - 3:00	32	J. Coleman	Charlestown High	Charlestown High
7:15 - 3:15	33	H. Dea	Charlestown High	Quincy
7:30 - 3:30	34	J. Giardina	East Boston High	McKay
7:00 - 3:00	37	A. Albano	East Boston High	Barnes
7:15 - 3:15	35	W. Baker	Charlestown High	Edwards
7:15 - 3:15	36	G. Guptill	Umana	Prescott
7:15 - 3:15	69	L. Higginbottom	Umana	Guild
8:00 - 4:00	100	P. Shaughnessy	Edwards	Eliot

Appendix V(cont.)

SAFETY SERVICES PERSONNEL DEPLOYMENT

BROWN ZONE

HOURS	UNIT NO.	OFFICER	PRIMARY	SECONDARY
7:00 - 3:00	12	SGT. J. Cronin	Technical	
8:00 - 4:00	48	J. Fortes	M. L. King	
7:00 - 3:00	79	S. Williams	Technical	Ellis Elementary
7:00 - 3:00	60	J. Hurney	Technical	Higginson - White Stadium
7:00 - 3:00	38	SGT. J. Dupree	J. E. Burke	
7:30 - 3:30	97	J. Finn	J. E. Burke	Murphy
7:30 - 3:30	43	J. Turner	J. E. Burke	King
7:30 - 3:30	47	I. Thibodeaux	J. E. Burke	Hernandez

RED ZONE

7:00 - 3:00	11	SGT. D. Rorie	Madison Park	
7:30 - 3:30	102	A. Hardaway	Madison Park	Mackey
7:30 - 3:30	86	J. LaSelva	Madison Park	Standby
7:30 - 3:30	99	J. Layton	Madison Park	Winthrop
7:00 - 3:00	85	T. Giannino	Madison Park	
7:30 - 3:30	71	K. Jackson	Madison Park	Timilty
7:00 - 3:00	84	R. Kelleher	Madison Park	
8:00 - 4:00	98	V. Younger	Dearborn	Wheatley
8:00 - 4:00	87	M. Ogarro	McCormack	Hurley
7:30 - 3:30	39	E. Johnson	Gavin	Wheatley
6:00 - 2:30	20	SGT. L. Allen	HHORC	
7:00 - 3:00	92	N. Sabator	HHORC	Standby
7:30 - 3:30	81	S. Rogers	HHORC	
7:30 - 3:30	89	J. DiReeno	HHORC	Standby
6:30 - 2:30	91	E. Knowlton	HHORC	

SCHOOL SAFETY AND SECURITY MONITORING: METHODOLOGY

In order to respond to the six monitoring objectives established for school safety and security, information was gathered from the following sources in the manner described under each:

1. BPS Office of School Operations
   - meeting with Deputy Superintendent Robert Peterkin to clarify informational needs for monitoring
   - written exchange of information
   - telephone conversations with Ronald Sprattling, Shirley Judge and Dr. Peterkin
2. BPS Department of Safety Services
   - meeting with Chief of Safety Services John Ghistolini, and Coordinator of Investigations John Sisco and inspection of communications network at the Safety Services Office
   - written information provided: incidents reports, Safety Procedural Manual, report on preparedness to handle racial disruptions, Boston School Police deployment sheet
   - numerous telephone conversations to gather and clarify information
3. English High School
   - meeting with Headmaster Corascadden and Assistant Headmaster in charge of discipline to discuss high incidents numbers at the school and other safety and security issues.
4. Safety School Commission Hearings
   - attendance at six of eight hearings held to date to hear about safety concerns within each district
5. Charlestown High
   - meeting with Headmaster Murphy, Ronald Sprattling from Office of School Operations and Val Shelley, discipline aide --- to discuss racial and other safety concerns at the school

6. South Boston High
    - meeting with Headmaster Winegar and the Assistant Headmaster to discuss racial and other safety issues at school in addition to other desegregation-related issues
7. Burke High School
    - meeting with Headmaster Holland to discuss special desegregation measures including safety concerns of school
8. Dorchester High
    - meeting with Headmaster Schwartz to discuss special desegregation measures including some safety issues affecting the school

BOSTON SCHOOL INCIDENTS ON SCHOOL PROPERTY

Crimes against Persons and Safety Related*

January 3 - April 29, 1983

High Schools		Middle Schools		Elementary	
English	75	Thompson	22	Tobin	7
Hyde Park	54	Roosevelt	15	Fuller	2
Brighton	41	Lewenberg	13	Fifield	2
Madison	28	Cleveland	7	Blackstone	2
Dorchester	17	Edwards	6	Hale	1
Boston Tech	16	Curley	6	Eliot	1
H.H. ORC	14	Lewis	5	Greenwood	1
Umana	13	Wilson	4	Beethoven	1
Charlestown	11	Taft	3	Wendell	1
West Roxbury	10	Mackey	3	Longfellow	1
South Boston	9	Edison	3	Jackson-Mann	1
Jamaica Plain	8	King	3	Ellis	1
McKinley	6	Gavin	3	Mattahunt	1
Burke	5	Irving	2	Tileston	1
East Boston	3	Rogers	2	Marshall	1
Boston Latin	3	Dearborn	2		
Copley Square	1	McCormack	2		
Boston High	1	McKay	2		
Boston Latin Academy	1	Shaw	2		
Boston Prep	1	Holmes	1		

* Includes - assaults, altercations, weapons possession, illegal or controlled substances, threats, arson, robbery, trespassing

Excludes - false fire alarms, illness, accidental injury, accidental fires, bomb threats

10. Student Discipline

STUDENT DISCIPLINE

INTRODUCTION

This segment of the report explores whether the Code of Discipline is being applied consistently throughout the Boston Public Schools. In order to be of value, a review of the implementation of a Code of Discipline should extend beyond a study of whether certain administrators assign more students to suspensions in their schools then do others. The review should determine whether school administrators act in accordance with the spirit of the Code.

The Code of Discipline issues several strong messages. These include the occasions administrators should discipline, the reasons for issuing discipline, and suggested alternatives to discipline. This Code attempts to serve as a unifier of the procedures for addressing student behavior which is detrimental to the learning process.

Due to these factors, we created three objectives which are more fully stated in the next segment. These objectives included reviewing statistical information, comparing patterns of treatment of students, among schools, and reviewing problem areas on-site. As is stated in the following segment, we were unable to fully meet our objectives. Still, our findings in this area are substantial. It is true that many schools in Boston are following the spirit of the Code. It is also true that some are not. During the next six months, we will be conducting on-site visits in order to be more fully able to report on the application of the Code.

FINDINGS

Objective One

To review, on a semi-annual basis, a report on suspensions and expulsions at each school, with the nature of the offense, grade, race, sex of the students effected, and length of time for each suspension.

The Boston School Department has not fully complied with our requests for information. The information which we have received was incomplete and was received four weeks late. We do not have information on expulsions of students. The information which is reported in the second objective was extracted from four different reports, covering two different periods of time.

Still, much of the information which we requested was provided to us. Further, we have begun to collaborate with the Boston School Department to assure that we receive information which is easily formated and timely.

Recommendation

That we continue to work with the Boston School Department in creating a format for information which collects and displays the information in a way which is readily accessible to the reader.

Objective Two

To determine, on the basis of these reports, whether the Code of Discipline is being followed consistently, and whether apparent patterns of unequitable treatment persist.

The information in this segment of the request was taken from an analysis of suspension reports for the months of January through April. Specifically, these reports listed suspensions by school, which included the school's district, total number of suspensions by type of suspendable offense, the suspensions by sex and by racial groups. A separate document provided a more meaningful perspective about the suspensions. This document was a list of suspensions from September, 1982 through February, 1983, by student, including the student's school, district, suspendable offense, length of suspension, sex and race. Other supporting documents provided additional information on suspensions during this time period.

Consistency in the application of the Code of Discipline in a stated objective of the Code. We have found that the number of suspensions by grade level varies little among the schools, with a few notable exceptions.

573

At the high school level, during the four month period of January through April, Charlestown High School suspended five hundred and sixty-six students, more than one suspension for every two students in the school. This rate was three times greater than English High School, the school with the next highest per pupil percentage of suspensions (Appendix One). Further examination of the situation at Charlestown High School showed that during September, 1982 through February 1983, there were eight hundred and eleven suspensions issued. Forty-three percent of those suspensions were issued to sixty-three students in the school, at a rate of 5.6 suspensions and fourteen missed days per student (Appendix Two).

In comparison, at English High School, which has twice the number of students than Charlestown High School, during September, 1982 through February, 1983, there were six hundred and seventy-five suspensions issued. Twenty-three percent of those suspensions were issued to thirty students, at a rate of 5.2 suspensions and fifteen and one-half missed days per student (Appendix Two).

At the middle school level, the Edwards Middle School suspended one hundred and eighty-two students during the four months of January through April, 1983, at a rate of more than one suspension for every three students (Appendix Three). This is more than two times the rate of the school with the next highest percentage, the Roosevelt Middle School. During September, 1982 through February 1983, the Edwards Middle School issued two hundred and eighty-seven suspensions. Forty-three percent of those suspensions were issued to nineteen students, at a rate of 6.4 suspensions and seventeen missed days per student.

In comparison, at the Roosevelt Middle School, fifty-four students were suspended, January through April. During September through February, the Roosevelt Middle School issued seventy-five suspensions, but only four students were suspended more than three times.

At the elementary level, only the McKay Elementary School was statistically notable. Sixty students were suspended, January through April. This represents thirty percent of the elementary students suspended city-wide (Appendix Four). During September through February, no students were suspended more than three times.

Recommendations

That the suspension practices of the schools noted above reflect the practices of schools throughout the city.

That the suspending of students in all schools, be a "last resort" as stated in the Code of Discipline. The Code offers numerous suggestions of alternatives to suspension. These should be established wherever possible.

That school administrators address the needs of students who are receiving multiple suspensions requiring that they miss a considerable number of days. Even when limited to use as a "last resort," suspension may exacerbate a student's learning problem. Students who are suspended several times gain nothing from the suspension, fall behind in their academic requirements and are pushed out of the school.

Objective Three

To monitor, on-site if necessary, schools in which there are apparent patterns of inequitable application of the Code of Discipline.

> As stated in the findings of the first objective, due to delays in receiving this information, we have been unable to monitor on-site. The need to gather more data exists. We will do this during the next few months.
>
> A final note, suspension data was analyzed by race. We were not able to identify any suspension inequities from the information provided. Future on-site monitoring will include a more comprehensive review of suspensions by race.

APPENDIX ONE

High Schools - Total Suspensions
January through April, 1983

School	Total Suspensions	Actual Enrollment	Percentage of Students Suspended
Brighton	85	1,119	7.59
Jamaica Plain	84	946	8.87
West Roxbury	43	1,315	3.26
Hyde Park	30	988	3.03
Burke	74	671	11.02
Dorchester	53	892	5.94
South Boston	40	926	4.31
Charlestown	566	949	59.64
East Boston	31	1,057	2.93
Boston	22	851	2.58
Boston Latin Academy	11	1,221	0.90
Boston Latin	109	2,160	5.04
Boston Tech	44	1,082	4.06
Copley Square	6	528	1.13
English	357	1,998	17.86
Madison Park	210	2,122	9.89
Umana	64	990	6.46
Total	1,829		

APPENDIX TWO

Charlestown High School

Actual Enrollment 2/24/83	949 students
Total suspensions 9/82-2/83	811 suspensions
Students with more than three suspensions	63 students
Total number of suspensions for the 63 students	353 suspensions
Total number of suspended days	868 days

Of the 63 students, 46 were male, 17 were female
29 were in the ninth grade
49 were black, 9 white, 5 other

English High School

Actual Enrollment 2/24/83	1,998 students
Total suspensions 9/82-2/83	675 suspensions
Students with more than three suspensions	30 students
Total number of suspensions for the 30 students	158 suspensions
Total number of suspended days	465 days

Of the 30 students, 25 were male, 5 were female
22 were in the ninth grade
26 were black, 3 were white

APPENDIX THREE

Middle Schools - Total Suspensions

January through April, 1983

School	Total Suspensions	Actual Enrollment	Percentage of Students Suspended
Edison	18	556	3.23
Taft	4	527	.75
Curley	62	653	9.49
Lewis	18	222	8.10
Roosevelt	54	323	16.71
Irving	64	669	9.56
Lewenberg	25	418	5.98
Shaw	9	327	2.75
Rogers	18	567	3.17
Thompson	57	450	12.66
Cleveland	32	949	3.37
Holmes	1	380	0.26
Wilson	9	716	1.25
Dearborn	29	347	8.35
Gavin	67	547	12.24
McCormack	40	626	6.38
Edwards	182	504	36.11
Michangelo	34	222	15.31
Timilty	44	422	10.42
Barnes	10	650	1.53
Cheverus	1	141	0.70
King	8	679	1.17
Mackey	58	491	11.81
Wheatley	23	330	6.96
Total:	867		

APPENDIX FOUR

Elementary Schools - Total Supspensions
January through April, 1983

School	Total Suspensions	Actual Enrollment	Percentage of Students Suspended
Tobin	12	461	2.60
Garfield	1	224	0.44
Winship	3	376	0.79
Agassiz	4	644	0.62
Manning	5	146	3.42
Beethoven	8	185	4.32
Lee	18	474	3.79
Mozart	3	154	1.94
Philbrick	2	116	1.72
Conley	6	180	3.33
Channing	2	245	0.81
Greenwood	4	408	0.98
P. A. Shaw	6	252	2.38
Endicott	7	204	3.43
Fifield	1	388	0.25
Holland	0	754	0.0
Marshall	12	754	1.59
Mather	1	479	0.20
Murphy	8	653	1.22
O'Hearn	2	147	1.36
Clap	0	189	0.0
Mason	3	152	1.97
Winthrop	0	173	0.0
Blackstone	1	738	0.13
Eliot	9	180	5.00
Kent	5	424	1.17
W. Prescott	3	382	0.78
O'Donnell	0	235	0.0
Guild	1	239	0.41
Hennigan	2	577	0.34
Jackson-Mann	11	794	1.38
McKay	60	516	11.62
Total:	200		

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Analysis of High School Suspensions, by Race

Suspension and other student discipline data is notoriously complex to analyze. The figures presented below should not be taken as proof of anything except the existence of a problem in certain schools. That problem may be the result of inequitable administration of student discipline, or of a school climate encouraging or provoking certain forms of behavior, or of the operation of external influences upon a school, or of all these and other factors combined.

The usefulness of such data is largely that it points to situations which call for closer investigation. Staff of the Department of Education will be conducting on-site monitoring in schools indicated by this data analysis, and a description of the nature of such monitoring is included with this report.

The chart prepared for this analysis includes the following information:

Column	
A	all Boston high schools (Latin Academy, Latin School, and Umana include grades 7-12; the others grades 9-12)
B	number of Black students, followed by Black percent of total enrollment
C	number of suspensions of Black students (not number of Black students suspended!), followed by Black percent of all suspensions
D	number of suspensions of Black students divided by number of Black students; followed by percent Black suspensions divided by percent Black students (1.00 would indicate that Black students are suspended at exactly the rate that their proportion of total enrollment would predict, while 2.00 would indicate suspensions at double the expected rate, and .5 at half the expected rate)
E-G	same information as B-D, for white students
H-J	same information as B-D, for other minority students

K	total enrollment of each school
L	total suspensions for each school
M	total suspensions divided by total enrollment; this is a measure of how frequently suspensions are necessary or resorted to (only closer analysis can determine whether suspensions are resorted to with excessive - or insufficient - frequency, and this analysis will be carried out during 1983-84)

Note that all data on suspensions is for the period September 1982 through February 1983, while enrollment data is for April 7th 1983.

Analysis

Charlestown High School has much the highest suspension rate overall (column M), with English High School a distant second. It appears that Latin Academy avoids suspensions almost entirely (data indicates only one ninth grader suspended, for "causing physical injury to another person"). East Boston, Copley, West Roxbury, Hyde Park, and South Boston resort to suspensions infrequently; to some extent this reflects in-school suspension programs. Note that a low suspension rate may not be a good thing if it is accompanied by a high degree of disruption and a perception of unsafety. Once again, only in-depth analysis, and correlation with our separate analyses of safety and security issues, of the preferences expressed by prospective ninth graders, and of special desegregation measures can give us an accurate picture of what the suspension data means.

Black students are suspended at three times the "expected" rate at Boston Latin School, and at twice the expected rate at Brighton and East Boston High Schools. Suspensions of Black students are also at substantially above the expected rate at Charlestown, Copley, and the Umana, and below the expected rate only at Hyde Park High. In view of the history of racial conflict at the latter, the low rate - though only marginally low - deserves review, as do the high rates at the other schools cited.

West Roxbury, Burke, Dorchester and Technical have Black suspensions rates only slightly above the expected level. While the heavily Black enrollment of Burke and Dorchester reduce the significance of this result, the other two schools are roughly half Black and their consistent suspensions rates are notable. In a study several years ago, sponsored by EEO and conducted by TDR Associates with a National Institute of Education contract, it was determined that, of all the factors associated with positive racial climate in a desegregated high school, the perception that discipline is administered fairly to all students is one of the two most important. Surely there must be a relation between the high number of first preferences by students of all racial/ethnic groups to attend West Roxbury (and, to a lesser extent, South Boston) and the statistical "fairness" of the suspensions at West Roxbury (followed, again, by South Boston). Hyde Park High, on the other hand, is preferred by relatively few students, despite roughly similar "fairness" of suspensions, which suggests the wisdom of a closer look.

Schools like West Roxbury and Boston Technical (and South Boston) with apparently fair suspension rates also deserve study to determine whether the elements of their success can be replicated.

Suspensions of white students are sharply under "expectation" at Burke (where the numbers are too small for real significance), Copley, Jamaica Plain, and the Umana. Suspensions of white students are above expectation at Hyde Park, which suggests a possible explanation for the moderate rate of Black suspensions there: most suspensions of both groups at Hyde Park are for fighting, which (in the case of racial incidents) often results in the suspension of both students involved. At Brighton High, by contrast, 13 Black and no white students were suspended for use of force, which suggests either that fighting is between Black students or that only Black students are suspended in such incidents. Somewhat the same pattern obtains at the Umana. Again, these are unsupported hypotheses.

Suspensions of other minority students are well below "expectation" at those schools - Brighton, Charlestown, English, Boston Latin - where this students are primarily Chinese or Indochinese, and closer but still below expectation in heavily Hispanic Jamaica Plain High. The averaging of these groups, and the fact that a high proportion are in bilingual programs from which they are unlikely to be suspended, makes this data particularly unreliable without on-site monitoring.

A final question, at this preliminary level: are Black and white students suspended for different offences? There seems to be less difference, overall and in all grades, than one might expect. The following analysis shows the reason for suspensions of Black and white male students:

Reason for Suspension	% of B	% of W
injury to another person	9.7%	9.5%
damaged or stole property	5.5%	5.3%
endangered another by use of force	25%	18.4%
possession of dangerous object	3.8%	2.7%
drugs or alcohol	4.7%	6%
disruption	23.8%	27.4%
preventing teaching	5%	4.6%
off limits	9.4%	6.5%
left without permission	6.7%	17.2%

Since most district high schools are located in predominantly white areas, it is not surprising that disruptive white students tend to leave the school, while disruptive Black students tend to "take their stand" off limits within school buildings.

All of the figures cited conceal the fact that ten suspensions may mean ten students suspended once each, or one "chronic offender" suspended ten times. The student services specialists within the Department of Education are reviewing data on the suspensions records of individual students to gain a far more accurate picture of the student discipline issues - and the areas of possible inequity - than is presented here.

CONCLUSION

Patterns exist which differentiate the high schools in Boston with respect to the outcomes of disciplinary actions. Whether and to what extent these patterns reflect discriminatory practices, school climate factors, possible disproportionate concentration of "chronic offenders" in certain schools, or other considerations cannot be determined without in-depth analysis and monitoring. I am informed that this will be a priority for the Division of Curriculum and Instruction beginning in September 1983.

Charles Glenn
June 9th 1983

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
School	Black			White		
Brighton	428	90	0.21	219	13	0.06
	40	82	2.05	20	12	0.60
Jam Pln	461	97	0.21	158	8	0.05
	50	69	1.38	17	6	0.35
West Rox	733	39	0.05	501	26	0.05
	57	59	1.04	39	39	1.00
Hyde Prk	738	34	0.05	220	13	0.06
	76	72	0.95	23	28	1.22
Burke	536	82	0.15	67	1	0.01
	82	92	1.12	10	1	0.10
Dorchest	633	56	0.09	123	8	0.07
	73	84	1.15	14	12	0.86
So. Bos	380	27	0.07	286	16	0.06
	42	54	1.29	32	32	1.00
Charlest	338	518	1.53	202	162	0.80
	36	64	1.78	21	20	0.95
East Bos	250	11	0.04	731	11	0.02
	24	48	2.00	71	48	0.68
Boston	439	51	0.12	191	8	0.04
	55	84	1.53	24	13	0.54
Latin Ac	420	1	0.00	632	0	0.00
all grad	35	100	2.86	52	0	0.00
Latin Sc	422	58	0.14	1345	34	0.03
all grad	20	61	3.05	63	36	0.57
Techn	528	15	0.03	311	10	0.03
	49	52	1.06	29	34	1.17
Copley	276	20	0.07	142	1	0.01
	53	95	1.79	27	5	0.19
English	1173	531	0.45	408	110	0.27
	62	79	1.27	22	16	0.73
Madison	1229	175	0.14	496	28	0.06
	58	69	1.19	23	11	0.48
Umana	489	120	0.25	287	16	0.06
all grad	50	82	1.64	29	11	0.38
all high	.5	0.71	1.42	.31	0.18	0.59
	8943	2031	0.23	5535	523	0.09

School	H Other	I	J	K Total	L	M
Brighton	435 40	7 6	0.02 0.15	1082	110	0.10
Jam Pln	296 32	36 26	0.12 0.81	915	141	0.15
West Rox	55 4	1 2	0.02 0.50	1239	66	0.05
Hyde Prk	18 1	0 0	0.00 0.00	976	47	0.05
Burke	53 8	6 7	0.11 0.88	656	89	0.14
Dorchest	110 12	3 4	0.03 0.33	866	67	0.08
So. Bos	241 27	7 14	0.03 0.52	907	50	0.06
Charlest	402 42	131 17	0.33 0.40	942	811	0.86
East Bos	53 5	1 4	0.02 0.80	1034	23	0.02
Boston	170 21	2 3	0.01 0.14	800	61	0.08
Latin Ac all grad	155 13	0 0	0.00 0.00	1207	1	0.00
Latin Sc all grad	380 18	3 3	0.01 0.17	2147	95	0.04
Techn	235 22	4 13	0.02 0.59	1074	29	0.03
Copley	99 19	0 0	0.00 0.00	517	21	0.04
English	303 16	34 5	0.11 0.31	1884	675	0.36
Madison	398 19	50 19	0.13 1.00	2123	253	0.12
Umana all grad	209 22	10 7	0.05 0.32	985	146	0.15
all high	.19 3327	0.11 312	0.57 0.09	17805	2366	0.16

Division of Curriculum and Instruction

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

MEMORANDUM

TO: James Case, Associate Commissioner
Division of Curriculum and Instruction

FROM: George S. Perry, Jr., Director for Student Services
Bureau of Student, Community, and Adult Services

DATE: 10 June 1983

SUBJECT: Monitoring Student Suspensions in the Boston Public Schools

---

As you are aware, Department staff members have reported on two aspects of student discipline in Boston public schools in prior memoranda. Our analysis of suspensions of students by school has shown that although the Code of Discipline suggests that students be suspended only as a disciplinary last resort, most schools at all three levels (high school, middle school and elementary school), suspend students regularly. There are a few schools which suspend students at a much greater rate than other schools of similar size and grade level. The analysis of suspensions of students within racial groups, prepared by the Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity, has shown that some schools suspend Black students, and one school suspends white students, at a greater rate than may be justifiable.

Still, statistical analysis may not present an accurate perception of the racial inequities in the suspensions of students. Student discipline issues do not lend themselves to easy analysis. Some factors which cause the need for suspension may be controlled by school administrators, others lie beyond the scope of the operation of the schools. Generally, the school's climate is determined by a number of internal and external factors which effect the ability of students, teachers, and administrators to be comfortable, safe, and productive in an educational setting. Therefore, since school administrators are unable to fully identify and/or remove internal and external factors which place restrictions upon the school climate, the administrators remove the students from the educational process who may violate rules in response to these restrictions. Usually, this does not rid the school of existing problems.

The process we have developed to monitor potential areas of racial inequities is intended to determine which combination of factors have lead to existing patterns of suspensions in certain schools. Only with this indepth analysis may we begin to suggest solutions to those areas we have determined to be inequitable.

Process

1. To identify schools which have a substantially higher than appropriate "expected" rate of suspension per racial group, and/or schools which have a high rate of suspension.

The expected rate of suspensions reflect the percent of suspensions by racial group of students divided by the percent of students who are members of the racial group within the school. This information is available from the analysis provided by Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity and our office.

2. To identify schools which have a substantially lower than appropriate "expected" rate of suspension per racial group, and/or schools which have a low rate of suspension.

This information is available from the analysis provided by the Bureau of Equal Educational Opportunity and our office.

3. To determine the rate of suspension per student within the schools identified in the first two steps of the process.

Our analysis has demonstrated that the total number of suspensions per school does not accurately represent the number of students who are suspended in some schools. Small groups of students within racial groups which account for large percentage of that racial group's suspensions may indicate that certain students are labeled as potential discipline problems by administrators, or that the students have chosen to continually disrupt the educational process. Numbers of suspensions which are distributed evenly among members of a racial group may indicate that a general sense of discomfort with the school exists for members of that racial group. Further statistical analysis this summer may allow us to identify additional problem areas.

4. To schedule on-site visits to schools identified in the first two steps of this process.

By reviewing the procedures in schools which demonstrate both types of suspension practices we may be able to identify factors which contribute to the differences in suspension practices which are unique to the City of Boston. The bureau staff members have had experience in working with schools that have developed alternative to suspension programs. The combination of our staff resources as well as recognizing potential resources within the Boston public schools, will provide us with practical suggestions for solutions to problems.

5. To discuss suspension practices with school administrators during the site visits.

The practices to be discuss with administrators will include the methods used to identify students accused of committing violations of the Code of Discipline, the due process procedures followed by school administrators, the actions taken by school administrators as alternatives to suspension (some which are suggested in the Code of Discipline), and the actions employed by school administrators to prevent the reoccurence of suspensions among students.

6. To discuss their behavior with a random sample of students who have been suspended on multiple occasions, particularly those students who have been suspended for disruption of the educational process, and/or endangering another by the use of force.

The areas to be discussed with students are the circumstances which led to their suspensions, the nature of their suspendable offense, the time of the year of their suspensions, their academic success before and after receiving suspensions, activities other than participation in academic studies which were denied by receiving suspensions, their decision to attend their present school/ classes, and the structure and climate of their academic classes.

No analysis of the factors leading to suspension of students may be complete without detailed discussion with students. The information provided by the students will be reviewed with the information provided by school administrators. By reviewing the perspectives of both parties involved in discipline issues, we hope to surface factors which one or the other group may be unable to identify.

7. To analyze the findings of these site visits and to suggest alternative strategies.

As mentioned above, it is our hope that by identifying factors which have led to a high rate of suspension and to racial inequities in suspensions, we may be better able to suggest alternative strategies which accurately address the unique problems faced by Boston public schools.

We realize that student discipline issues are a daily concern of school administrators. It is also evident that many schools suspend students. It is rare that an incident occurs within the school for which suspension is absolutely necessary. The Code of Discipline encourages the use of suspension only as a last resort. Until it is so used, suspension inequities, however minimal, will occur.

11. Institutional Pairings

MONITORING AREA: UNIVERSITY PAIRINGS

I. Objective: To ensure that the Boston Public Schools use their "best efforts" to negotiate a contract with the universities listed in the Student Desegregation Plan of May 10, 1975.

A. Data Gathering: The Department reviews annually all of the Chapter 636 proposals that support the pairings. In addition, Department staff is in frequent communication with the university coordinators, both individually and as a group.

B. Findings: Although the pairings are shifting somewhat, especially with the colleges and universities in the suburbs, these changes are apparently by mutual consent, and do not represent bad faith on the part of the Boston Public Schools.

C. Recommendations: None

INSTITUTIONAL PAIRINGS

Pairings with Business Organizations As of May, 1983

1. Blue Cross Blue Shield Madison Park H.S.
2. Boston Edison - Boston Technical H.S.
3. Boston Gas - Jamaica Plain H.S.
4. Federal Rserve - South Boston H.S.
5. Bank of Boston - Hyde Park H.S.
6. Gilette - South Boston H. S.
7. Honeywell - Brighton H.S.
8. IBM - Boston Latin Academy
9. John Hancock - English H.S.
10. Liberty Mutual - Charlestown H.S.
11. Massport - East Boston H.S. and Umana
12. National Shawmut Bank - Copley H.S.
13. Bank of New England - W. Roxbury H.S.
14. N. E. Mutual Life - Burke H.S.
15. N. E. Telephone - Dorchester H.S.
16. Prudential - Boston H.S.
17. State Street Bank - Boston Latin H.S.
18. Stop and Shop - Humphrey Occ. Resource Center
19. Travelers - Jamaica Plain H.S.
20. New England Medical Center - Humphrey Occ. Resource Center
21. Digital - Humphrey Occ. Resource Center
22. Veterans' Admin. Hospital - Humphrey Occ. Resource Center and Jamaica Plain H.S.
23. St. Elizabeth's Hospital - Brighton H.S.

Boston - Chapter 636 - FY 1983

University Pairings

	College	Amount	Districts/Schools
1)	Boston College	$ 136,600	District III
2)	Boston University	181,444	District I; IX (Boston Latin)
3)	Bunker Hill Community College	76,237	District VII
4)	Cambridge College	56,473	District IX (King)
5)	Curry College	3,203	District IX (Trotter)
6)	Emanuel College	45,665	District IX (Ohrenberger)
7)	Emerson College	7,000	District IX (Copley Sq.)
8)	Lesley College	67,246	District IX (Guild, Hennigan)
9)	Massachusetts College of Art	77,116	Districts V; IX (English)
10)	Massachusetts College of Pharmacy	91,999	District IX (Mackey)
11)	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	67,172	District IX (Umana)
12)	Northeastern University	248,271	Districts VII; IX (Latin Academy)
13)	Harvard University	37,136	Central Office
14)	Regis College	43,170	District IX (Latin Academy)
15)	Simmons College	54,026	District II, Jamaica Plain
16)	Stonehill College	105,721	District IV; Hyde Park
17)	Tufts University	24,260	District IX (Technical)
18)	University of Massachusetts/Amherst	39,277	District IX (English)
19)	University of Massachusetts/Boston	327,330	Districts V, VI
20)	Wheelock College	167,191	District IX (J.M. Curley, Hale, Haley, Hernandez, McKay)
		$1,856,537	

The table above shows the amount of grants by the Board of Education in the 1982-83 school year to support the school/university pairings.

12. Parent and Student Organizations

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education - Bureau of School Programs

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169

TO: Charlie Glenn

FROM: Herman Hernandez Santana
Doreen H. Wilkinson

DATE: May 24, 1983

SUBJECT: Parent Organizations Monitoring

Methodology:

Information regarding the activities of the Court-ordered Parent Organizations City-wide Parents Council (CPC) and School Parent Councils (SPC), in response to state monitoring objectives was derived from these sources:

- attendance at Co-Chair Meetings at CPC Headquarters,
- review of minutes from regular CPC Meetings which detail the progress of that organization in carrying-out court-ordered activities,
- many telephone calls to Executive Director, James Stanton, and other staff,
- telephone discussions with James Walsh and Robert Peterkin from the Boston School department,
- monitoring of CPC Task Force on Charlestown High.

MONITORING OBJECTIVES

1. To determine whether Parent Councils have been monitoring matters which are apt to facilitate or hinder the desegregation process in particular schools, districts and/or city-wide. For instance, monitoring implementation of court orders for special desegregative measures at some schools, repair and construction of facilities, vocational and occupational programs and support of participation by college, business and cultural pairings.

Finding:

The monitors feel secure in stating that the CPC and its SPC have been monitoring matters which pertain to the desegregation process in particular schools and throughout the city. In particular, the CPC has monitored desegregation activities throughtout the city through monthly reports written by school principals and district superintendents provided to the CPC through the Office of School Operations. These reports contain information about all major school happenings, problems, suspensions, attendance, reading and other test scores, parent and student organizations and more.

In addition, the CPC has monitored special desegregation measures being implemented at Dorchester High, Burke High and the Tobin School.

The CPC has just completed hiring staff to do necessary monitoring and other functions. At present there are no staff assigned to monitor vocational and occupational education, or the business, college and cultural pairings. They are requesting additional funds in order to fulfill their monitoring responsibilities in these areas.

2. To determine whether parents have been responsible for planning and investigating matters involving racial harmony at their school. Also, whether they have had access to the school records and have been able to send out pamphlets and newsletters and visit other schools. And to determine if parent councils have proposed modification of student activity programs and received reasonable operating expenses from the individual schools.

Finding:

The monitors have found that the CPC and SPC have been addressing issues of racial harmony within schools. In particular, the CPC and SPC are actively monitoring racial and other problems affecting desegregation at Charlestown High, the Umana Technical School and the Gavin Middle School, with the intent of (1) offering suggestions to alleviate racial and other problems and (2) being instumental in implementing whatever plan is devised.

According to CPC officials, there are still problems concerning the cooperation of the local schools in providing funds and other resources to send out pamphlets, and newsletters. According to Boston School Officials, the $500,000 budget allocated to the CPC should cover the costs of stamps newsletters, etc. There will be a hearing on this issue shortly.

3. To determine whether the Boston Public Schools have provided to parent councils the monthly and semi-annual reports by principals and community district superintendents and to the CPC other reasonable educational statistics and data analysis.

Finding:

The CPC has received as stated under Objective #1, the monthly and annual reports from principals and district superintendents through the Office of School Operations. Progress in getting other data and statistics which the CPC has requested in fulfilling monitoring functions, is being made.

4. To determine whether parents have participated in the evaluation of community district superintendents and of principals, and the screening and rating for administrative positions.

Finding:

The monitors have found that through the CPC, a parents committee is being formed to negotiate with the Boston Public Schools on charges in the specific format of instruments used to evaluate principals and district superintendents. This same parents committee is working with the Mass Advocacy Center in developing alternatives to the existing instrument and in training parents to serve on screening committees at individual schools and at the district levels.

5. To determine whether parents have participated in collective bargaining, budget review process, major policy planning initiatives, and training of school department staff as provided by the November 8, 1982 Agreement.

Finding:

Collective Bargaining: The Executive Director of the CPC has confirmed the involvement of a sub-committee of the CPC in the collective bargaining process now going on.

However, it is his opinion that Boston School Officials are not sharing all data relative to informed decision-making in order for CPC participation to be meaningful. Documents relating to teachers' contracts were not shared with CPC. CPC have shared this concern in writing to Robert Hayden and are still awaiting a response. Boston feels that all appropriate documents were shared with CPC.

School-based Budget Review Process: Parents are participating in the budget review process at local schools for the first time. However, many parent participants have complained that the two-week period for reviewing, discussing and making recommendations on local school budgets is not enough time to complete the entire process properly. This year under the new Trager Bill no one, including school principals, was given enough time for meaningful input. Boston officials would like to see a more realistic time-line next year.

Central Level Budget Review: CPC budget committee members are participating very effectively in budget planning for 1983-84. They feel they will have a positive impact on the 1983-84 budget.

Policy Planning Initiatives: The CPC members are actively involved in reviewing and responding to educational policy proposals coming from the Boston Central Office, the Educational Planning Group and any other educational policy proposals affecting Boston Public Schools. They have already responded in writing, to some draft reports coming from the Educational Policy Group.

In addition, the CPC is working on the development of an improved and extensive drug and alcohol abuse program to become a part of the regular Boston Curriculum. They are dissatisfied with existing programs in this area.

The CPC is also participating in planning now taking place in the Boston Public Schools to coordinate an inter-organizational proposal which will bring local social and human service agencies into a closer working relationship with Boston Public Schools. They are trying to insure that the 20% parent participation on the Board of such an inter-agency organization, specified in November 8, 1982 Agreement with the Boston Public Schools, is realized.

Staff Training: Training sessions were planned around awareness raising of the activities of CPC.

6. To determine whether: (1) all elections to parent councils have been conducted, (2) councils are properly organized and meeting, and, (3) whether council staff are racially balanced.

Finding:

Elections: Elections for parent councils were held in November 1982. Over 1,000 parents are now on these councils.

Organization: Improvement of participation and in the frequency of local school SPC meetings has been noted by the Executive Director. Meetings are held monthly.

Racial Balance of Council Staff: The CPC staff, most of whom have been recently hired, are racially balanced. There are 21 staff members (7 blacks, 6 whites, 4 Hispanic, 4 Asian).

Division of Curriculum and Instruction
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts 02169
Bureau of Student, Community and Adult Services

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jim Case

FROM: George Perry

DATE: 17 May 1983

SUBJECT: CONSENT DEGREE OF BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS - STUDENT GOVERNANCE

INTRODUCTION

The court ordered Amalgamation Plan was revised by Boston School Department's submission of a plan on 28 September 1982. The court has not yet ordered the revision although no counter proposals or disagreements have been filed with the court. It is our opinion that the Boston School Committee is allowed to restructure the school system's student government, provided that the revision does not violate the intentions of the original Amalgamation Plan.

As a result of this revision, our monitoring objectives have been redefined. These objectives for both the high schools and middle schools are:

1. To assure that the democratic election procedures and special election procedures when necessary have been established for each school.
2. To determine that student leadership training sessions, for the purpose of preparing racially representative student groups to coordinate and facilitate student council elections, were conducted by the Boston school department.
3. To determine that each school has a student council which meets once a month.
4. To assure that the Racial-Ethnic Student Council Subcommittee has been established in each school, and that it has met once a month.
5. To assure that a Boston Student Advisory Council (BSAC) has been established and has met once a month. Also, to determine that each high school has four student representatives.
6. To determine that the officers of the BSAC have met with the Boston School Committee at least once every other month.

7. To assure that a BSAC Executive Committee has been established and has met twice weekly with the purpose of becoming involved in all student affairs initiatives emanating from the Boston Public Schools office of School Operations.

8. To assure that there exists student representation to all parent councils.

The request for documentation which demonstrate compliance with these eight areas was submitted to Dr. Peterkin on 29 March 1983 (see Appendix One). We received the documentation on 2 May 1983, keeping with our timeline.

RESULTS OF OUR MONITORING EFFORT

The following are the findings of our office on the eight objectives.

Objective - To assure that democratic election procedures and special election procedures when necessary have been established for each school.

Finding - Seventeen high schools and eleven middle schools submitted documentation of their election procedures. Of these, only one school found it necessary to have special election procedures. The majority of schools held elections for representatives from home rooms. This is one of the three optional methods of elections listed in the Amalgamation Plan.

Recommendation - That a standard election packet be sent to all schools prior to elections. This packet should contain election procedures, affidavits and blank forms to record information about elected students. These completed forms should be signed by the headmasters and returned to the Deputy Superintendent's office within ten days of the elections.

Objective - To determine that student leadership training sessions for the purpose of preparing racially representative student groups to coordinate and facilitate student council elections were conducted by the Boston School Department.

Finding - A student leadership training session was held during the summer. Twenty-one students participated in the session. From the documentation provided to us, we were not able to accurately determine the number of schools which sent representatives to the training session. We know the number of schools to be considerably less than the seventeen high schools.

Recommendation - In order that truly representative elections are held, it is important that students from all schools, both high schools and middle schools, attend a comprehensive training session.

Objective - To determine that each school has a student council which meets once a month.

Finding - While the Boston School Department was unable to provide full documentation on each school's monthly student council, we have received an assurance that student councils meet at least once a month in all high schools, except West Roxbury High School. We have received scattered documentation about monthly meetings at the middle school level.

Recommendation - As was mentioned in the school department's summary provided with the requested documentation, Executive Committee members share information about their student council meetings bi-weekly. Therefore, there is little need for formal documentation, except in schools where problems have been identified. Better analysis of the middle school student governments should be developed.

Objective - To assure that the Racial-Ethnic Student Council Subcommittee has been established in each school, and that it has met once a month.

Finding - While many schools have established a Racial-Ethnic Student Council Subcommittee,the documentation provided demonstrates that "meaningful" meetings are rarely scheduled.

Recommendations - The Boston School Department believes that the Racial-Ethnic Student Council Subcommittees no longer serve a meaningful purpose. Although racially motivated issues still occur, they are not as substantial as when these subcommittees were created. Yet, it is our opinion that students and school personnel should be able to have grievances addressed by a representative impartial body. Other communities have established "fairness committees" as a solution to simular problems.

Since these Racial-Ethnic Student Council Subcommittees remain part of the Amalgamation Plan, the plan should be altered further to more fully address the current needs of Boston Public School students.

Objective - To assure that a Boston Student Advisory Committee (BSAC) has been established and has met once a month. Also, to determine that each high school has four representatives.

Finding - We were not provided with a list of BSAC members so we were not able to verify that all schools participate in the BSAC. We have received documentation of the agendas and minutes of the BSAC monthly meetings. It appears that the BSAC has been actively involved as a city-wide student organization, sharing information about administrative decisions among students and addressing issues which concern Boston students.

Recommendation - To continue to strengthen the role of the BSAC. Much progress has been made this year.

Objective - To determine that the officers of the BSAC have met with the Boston School Committee at least once every other month.

Finding - This objective has been met and has produced positive results.

Recommendation - This vital line of communication should grow stronger with time.

Objective - To assure that a BSAC Executive Committee has been established and has met twice weekly to become involved in all student affairs initiatives emanating from the Boston Public Schools office of School Operations.

Finding - It is difficult to assess whether the BSAC Executive Committee has become involved in all student affairs initiatives. It does appear, from our involvement with members of the BSAC Executive Committee, that progress has been made instrengthening this organization during the past year.

Recommendation - The Boston School Department will continue its efforts to strengthen communication between schools. This organization serves as a "linking-pin" to the entire student governance structure. Plans to hire a full time advisor will improve the operations of the BSAC Executive Committee. Also, continued support by the School Committee and individual headmasters is critical to the success of the BSAC Executive Committee.

Objective - To assure that student representation exists to all parent councils.

Findings - The available documentation identified few student representatives to parent councils.

Recommendations - Students should be represented on parent councils since parents are often the greatest advocates of student interests. Whenever possible, training for students in effective methods for working with adults would be extremely helpful.

B. Fairness Committees

Fairness Committees should be designed in each school. There are several models which are effective in conflict resolution. A fairness committee whose members are students, teachers, and administrators, is a forum for students and teachers to talk over their differences with a group of their peers. Models stress conflict resolution with fairness for all parties being the goal of the hearings. Existing fairness committees in Cambridge and Brookline public schools, deal with issues such as:

1. Misunderstandings of rules or situations.
2. Judgments or decisions where one party feels dissatisfied.
3. Enforcement of rules or granting of privileges.
4. Behavior within the school which is objectionable for teachers, students, or administrators.

Educational goals through fairness models include:

1. Developing listening and discussion skills.
2. Developing positive attitudes toward school through the experience of shared decision-making.
3. Developing analytical skills for understanding moral and legal issues.
4. Developing the value that productive problem-solving approaches involve negotiations and compromise.
5. Developing reasoning abilities.
6. Developing personally, particularly growth in self-knowledge and self-esteem.
7. Addressing the sense of helplessness members of the school community have about situations which occur during the school day.

Dispute Resolution

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

TALLULAH MORGAN, et al.,
Plaintiffs

v. C.A. 72-911-G

KEVIN A. McCLUSKEY, et al.,
Defendants

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF RESOLUTION REGARDING DESEGREGATION DISPUTE

The following report and recommendation of resolution is filed in accordance with section V(D)(3) of the Orders of Disengagement entered on December 23, 1982.

I. EFFORTS TOWARD RESOLUTION

The present dispute was first noted in a letter dated March 28, 1983 from Counsel for the Boston Teachers Union, Local 66, AFT, AFL-CIO (hereafter "the BTU"), a limited intervenor in this action, to the Defendant Superintendent of the Boston Public Schools. (See Attachment A). Acting through its General Counsel, School Defendants replied on April 12, 1983 and refused to take any further action on the BTU complaint. (See Attachment B.) Negotiations were requested by the BTU (see Attachment C, letter of James T. Grady to Michael J. Betcher dated April 19, 1983), but a telephone discussion conducted between the parties on April 26, 1983 failed to produce a resolution. (See Attachment D, letter of Michael J. Betcher to James T.

Grady dated April 25 [sic?], 1983.) The BTU then requested mediation by the State Board by letter dated May 5, 1983 (see Attachment E), a request that the State Board received on May 6. A mediation session was conducted by counsel to the State Board on May 19, 1983, at which both parties to the dispute stated their positions. The BTU also placed five Exhibits into evidence.

The parties having failed to reach argreement within the three week period provided for in section V(D)(2 and 3) of the Orders of Disengagement, the State Board has drafted the present Report and Recommendation.

II. POSITIONS OF THE INTERESTED PARTIES

A. The BTU

The BTU has challenged the action by Defendant School Committee that abolished approximately 120 "Assistant Headmaster/Subject Area" positions and created in their place approximately 90 "Department Head" positions.

This change was proposed by Defendant Superintendent, in a March 16, 1983 memorandum to the President and Members of Defendant School Committee. (BTU Exhibit 1) The BTU cites language at page 2 of this memorandum ("These [Assistant Headmaster/Subject Area] positions do not exercise supervision over teachers and cannot, by an arbitration decision, evaluate teachers. The position, therefore, does not meet the needs of the system.") as evidence that the proposed change is in retaliation of an adverse labor arbitration award of May 7, 1982. (BTU Exhibit 2) The proposal of Defendant Superintendent was enacted by a vote of Defendant School Committee on March 22, 1983 (BTU Exhibit 3), and a job circular for acting appointments to the newly created positions was posted on May 10, 1983. (BTU Exhibit 4)

The BTU argues that the above actions fail to comply with section 8 of the February 24, 1976 Order for Desegregation of Administrative Staff in two respects:

(1) While footnote 12 to said section 8 states that "Nothing herein prohibits the elimination of any second category position for educational, financial or other reasons," said footnote was not intended to validate any otherwise unlawful reorganization, effected solely in retaliation of an adverse labor arbitration award. The actions of School Defendants amount to the removal of up to 120 individuals previously screened and rated for their present position, the retitling of the position in question, and the formal notification of Assistant Headmasters/Subject Area that they will be returned to their previously held teaching positions with a commensurate cut in salary. (The BTU also claims that all black Assistant Headmasters /Subject Area have been informally told that they will receive appointments to the new Department Head positions.) Such actions are contrary to the spirit and intent of the February 24, 1976 Orders.

(2) Section 8 also provides, in relevant part, that "Second category administrative positions and any newly established equivalent positions shall be filled by permanent appointees as soon as administratively feasible..." Yet the job circular states that "all positions will be filled on an acting basis pending promotional rating." The BTU has been informed that these positions will in all likelihood remain acting for at least one year. This is a clear violation of the language quoted above. If the proposed reorganization is allowed to go forward, the new positions should be filled with permanent appointments.

B. School Defendants

(1) Regarding the elimination of the Assistant Headmaster/Subject Area position and the creation of Department Heads, School Defendants argue that this is a bona fide reorganization undertaken in good faith.

609

Since the action in question complies with footnote 12 of the February 24, 1976 Order, the Court has no jurisdiction. Even assuming that School Defendants were found to be commiting an unfair labor practice, the reorganization would not be transformed into a desegregation issue.

School Defendants' counsel was unaware that black Assistant Headmasters /Subject Area have been guaranteed appointments to the new position of Department Head. School Defendants will endeavor to maintain a proportionate number of black appointees (on the order of 20%) in the new position.

(2) Regarding the issue of permanent versus acting appointments, School Defendants shall make the appointments permanent, in accordance with section 8 of the February 24, 1976 Order, "as soon as administratively feasible." Administrative feasibility in this instance shall be determined by the final resolution of the disputed reorganization in all forums, which is not likely to occur before September 1984. School Defendants have offered to consider all incumbent Assistant Headmasters/Subject Area as finalists in the coming round of acting Department Head appointments, if the BTU agrees to this approach.

III. OTHER FORUMS

The reorganization is currently being challenged in three other forums:

(A) The BTU has sought the issuance of an unfair labor practice complaint from the Labor Relations Commission. (See Memorandum of BTU, BTU Exhibit 5). On May 27, 1983, the Labor Relations Commission issued the requested complaint, and scheduled a formal hearing on June 20, 21 and 22, 1983. (See BTU Exhibit 6, submitted to the State Board by mail according to agreement of the parties to the dispute.)

(B) After issuance of the Labor Relations Commission complaint, the BTU moved to enjoin the elimination of the Assistant Headmaster/Subject

Area position in the Superior Courts of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. A hearing on the motion has been scheduled for June 13, 1983. (See School Defendants Exhibit 1, submitted to the State Board on June 1, 1983.)

(C) The BTU has also filed a grievance under the terms of its collective bargaining agreement with School Defendants. The grievance is at step 3, awaiting arbitration.

IV. RECOMMENDATION OF RESOLUTION

A. On the issue of the elimination of the Assistant Headmaster/Subject Area position, the State Board recommends that no action be taken in the context of the desegregation litigation. The legality of the reorganization in question is a matter of labor law and does not on its face violate the provisions of the February 24, 1976 Order. The Labor Relations Commission has already indicated its intention to resolve the charges of improper retaliatory reorganization, and the state Superior Court has scheduled a hearing on the matter. There is no reason to preempt these authorities on a question properly within their jurisdiction.

B. On the issue of acting appointments, the State Board recommends that School Defendants go forward with appointments on an acting basis at the present time, provided that the Department Head positions shall be filled on a permanent basis immediately after the conclusion of Labor Relations Commission and arbitration proceedings currently in progress. The potential for an adverse ruling from the Labor Relations Commission and/or an arbitrator creates sufficient uncertainty regarding the ultimate result of the reorganization to raise the issue of administrative feasibility. The proposed acting appointments must not be maintained, however, once the underlying issues have been addressed in other forums.

Respectfully submitted,

THE MASSACHUSETTS BOARD OF EDUCATION

By its attorneys

Robert H. Blumenthal

Robert H. Blumenthal, Esq.
1385 Hancock Street
Quincy, Massachusetts 02169
(617) 770-7315

Robert H. Bohn, Jr. /RHB

Robert H. Bohn, Jr., Esq.
Special Assistant Attorney General
Gitlin, Emmer, Kaplan & Bohn
160 Milk Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
(617) 451-6970

DATE: June 6, 1983